BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VIII. NEW YORK, JANUARY, 1853. NO. 1.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 140 Fulton-street, (Up Stairs.)

TERMS.--Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

THE CHRISTIANITY OF ITS FIRST PREACHERS.

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM, ENGLAND.

"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively (literally, *living*) hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God, through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time."—1 Peter 1: 3-5.

Our text records the devotional enthusiasm which animated the Apostle Peter, when inditing his epistle to the Christian disciples scattered throughout Asia Minor. With characteristic fervor he commences his pastoral letter with a devout benediction on God for the manifestation of his mercy through Jesus Christ, in which we have a circumstantial detail of the special benefits which God has bestowed on us through the mediation of his Son. This detail, though brief, is very comprehensive, and being conveyed in very explicit language, we may learn hence the summary of Apostolic doctrine. To exhibit this detail of Christian truth by a simple and brief analysis of the text at the head of these remarks, is the object we desire to accomplish in this tract. Regarding the author of our text as the exponent of Apostolic Christian teaching, we have, in unmistakable language, the doctrinal Christianity of its first preachers, with which, as the true and unvarying type, we may compare the doctrinal Christianity of modern times.

And, first, let it be observed, that whatever are the special benefits of the Gospel, their source is the "*abundant mercy*" of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. This is their soul, unmixed source—the *abundant mercy* of the great universal Father, whose name is LOVE. In the work of Christ except as the Divinely commissioned Rebuker of sin, every indication of Divine severity was withdrawn. That work was the mission of "*peace on earth, and good-will towards men.*" The earthly life of Jesus was the ever memorable season when GOD, whose name is LOVE, "*in very deed, dwelt with man on earth.*" Nothing was either *done* or *endured* by our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, in the public action of redemption, but what evolved and exalted God's "ABUNDANT MERCY." The foundation of the Gospel is laid in free, unconstrained, unpurchased grace or mercy. "By grace are ye saved,"

The benefits of the Christian religion are thus expressed: Believers are "*begotten again unto a living hope*," or hope of Life. Before they know and rejoice in Christ, believers are among the "*Congregation of the dead.*"—Prov. 21: 16; but by the Gospel, they have been begotten, or born again from the dead unto a hope of life, which hope will be realized at the time of "the first Resurrection," which is called "the Resurrection of life."—John 5: 29. And for this hope of life, we are indebted to "*the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead;*" who, as the second Adam, or representative Head of the race, is the Ransomer of a sepulchred world; the Light and the Life of men. Should this hope ever "stagger in unbelief," it is at once rebuked, and strengthened by the historic fact —"*the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead,*" as "the first fruits of them that slept."

What this life is, Peter proceeds to explain. It is "*an inheritance,*" that is, believers are now only "heirs" of life; at present they "*are dead,*" (subject to death,) *and their life is hid with Christ in God.*" "*When* Christ who is our life, shall appear, *then* shall ye also," &c.—Col. 3: 4. It is "incorruptible," in contrast with the life they now live, which is corruptible. It is "*undefiled,*" a life entirely free from the taint of sin and impurity. It "*fadeth not away;*" it is immortal, eternal life. The life which is to be the portion of the faithful followers of Christ, and which is to be introduced by the resurrection of the dead, has no elements of corruptibility and decay, like the mortal life they now experience. The present life of man is corruptible, defiled, and fades away. "All flesh is grass, and all the *glory* of man (his grandeur as an intellectual and rational being,) as the flower of grass,"—more beautiful, but yet as perishable, for "the grass withereth," and also, "*the flower thereof falleth away; but the word of the Lord endureth forever; and this is the word* (of everlasting endurance) *which, by the Gospel, is preached unto you.*" This is the Gospel revelation of "EVERLASTING LIFE."

At present, this glorious inheritance of an undefiled endurance forever, is enjoyed only by anticipation. Now, believers "*hope,*" for it as a benefit in prospect. Hence, Paul says, "We are saved by *hope*, but hope that is seen, is not hope, for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we, with patience, *wait* for it."—Rom. 8: 24, 25. And in the verse preceding this quotation, he states what is the believers' hope, for which they patiently "*wait.*"—"We, ourselves, groan within ourselves, *waiting for* the adoption, viz: THE REDEMPTION OF OUR BODY." Paul, along with the believers of his time, groaned and waited for *resurrection*, as he also says in another place—"That I may know him, and the *power of his resurrection*. . . . if by any means *I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.*" Phil 3: 10, 11. Peter states the same doctrine as

Paul; neither of these Apostles tells us of any hope or reward for believers, until the time of resurrection. Thus in our text we are told that the inheritance is "RESERVED *in heaven*," and *ready* TO BE REVEALED IN THE LAST TIME;" and that believers, whether among the living or the dead, are now "*kept by the power of God*" until the time of their future "salvation." The faith of all who have "died in faith" has no acknowledgment, until "*the appearing of Jesus Christ.*" In the state of death "*they rest from their labors*, and their works (the fruit of their faith) do follow them." There they slumber in undisturbed repose, until "all that are in the graves shall hear Christ's voice, and shall come forth;" when their works shall be "made manifest that they were wrought in God," and their faith shall receive the great reward. "Wherefore," says Peter, in the 13th verse of this chapter, "Gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end, *for the grace that is to be brought unto you* AT THE REVELATION OF JESUS CHRIST."

Now, this text is virtually Peter's Confession of Faith—the formally announced articles of his Christian Creed. We will arrange the separate doctrinal items of our text in contrast with the doctrinal articles of the so-called orthodox faith of our own times.

APOSTOLIC CREED *Of the 1st Century.*	ORTHODOX CREED *Of the 19th Century.*
1.—God saves us by His *abundant mercy*, through Jesus Christ.	1.—God saves us by *satisfying the inflexible demands of His justice*, through Jesus Christ.
2.—Believers are begotten again unto *a hope of life* by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.	2.—Believers never needed a *hope* of life, since, in common with all men, they are immortal beings, and could never lose their life. Their hope in Christ is a *hope of happiness.*
3.—The inheritance of believers is *reserved* in heaven, and ready to be revealed in *the last time*, at the *revelation*, or second *appearance* of Jesus Christ.	3.—The inheritance of believers *awaits* them in heaven, and is ready to be revealed *as soon as they die.*
4.—The future life of believers is obtained by *rising from the dead at the time of Christ's second appearing*, as "the resurrection and the life."	4.—The future life of believers is first enjoyed as *bodiless souls, immediately after they die*; and after this they have a kind of second future life, when their souls enter into their spiritual bodies at the time of resurrection.
5.—The expectation of believers is *the second coming of Christ, to raise the dead*, for "*if the dead rise not, then they which have fallen asleep in Christ have perished.*"—1 Cor. 15: 16-18.	5.—The expectation of believers is, to go to glory when they die, as disembodied souls,—and they do not believe they would "perish," even though there should be no resurrection!

Reader! "Beware, lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ."—Col. 2: 8.

"THE PENALTY OF THE LAW."

BRO. STORRS:—In the last Examiner, "Veritas" says, "The mediation of the Son of God is necessary for the deliverance of Adam's seed from the penalty of the law, which is eternal death."

Now, as I am an "*Inquirer*," I should like to know how there can be any deliverance to man at all if "the penalty is eternal death." I apprehend our minds are not entirely divested of Babylonish garments, but that we are all more or less entangled in the old swaddling clothes. It does really seem to me there is not, and in the nature of the case there cannot be any *deliverance* from the penalty of *eternal* death: "The wages of sin *is death*;"—and the wages of *the sin* of rejecting the gospel scheme of deliverance from death is "*everlasting destruction*," or "eternal death." But from this there is no deliverance, and can be none; for God's word cannot be set aside. If then "the penalty of the law" on "Adam's seed," for Adam's sin, was "eternal death," there could have been no hope for them, as God's law cannot be revoked; and a *substitute* could not deliver from *such* a death without perishing himself, so far as I can see. It seems to me "Adam's seed" were "subjected to vanity [or death] not willing [or from voluntary sin, like Adam] but by reason [or the choice] of him who hath subjected *in hope*,"—viz: of a *resurrection.* That is—whatever may be said of Adam himself, his *seed* were not under "the penalty of *eternal* death;"—hence there was *hope* for them, which would not have been the case otherwise. The sin, the penalty of which is eternal death, I do think, hath never forgiveness. John saith—"There is a sin *unto death*:" and adds—"I do not say that he shall pray for it." He also tells us—"There is a sin *not* unto death:" I John v. 16, 17.

I have expressed my objections to the foregoing statement of Veritas freely, for the sake of getting all the light I can on the law and the testimony, that blessed lamp God has given us. May we better understand it, and then I am sure we shall love its Author more. INQUIRER.

SUPPOSED STRONGHOLD

Of the Doctrine of the Soul's Separate State.

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM, ENGLAND.

"Therefore we are always confident, knowing that while we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord; (for we walk by faith, not by sight:) we are confident, I say, and willing, rather to be absent from the body, and be present with the Lord."—2 Cor. 5: 6-8.

The author of our text, in an epistle to another church, enjoins the following admirable practice, as becoming the Christian intelligence and piety of all believers:—"Despise not prophesyings: prove all things: hold fast that which is good." But alas! the history of Christianity—the religion of liberty, the friend of free thought and free utterance—has presented the painful spectacle of a systematic *prohibition* of prophesyings, and a *forcible stereotyping* of "all things," both bad and "good." Through long ages of spiritual darkness and despotism, the liberty of prophesying was, in the name of Christ and Christianity, denied to any but such as had received due authority from Pope or Parliament-made Bishops, which sacerdotal veto, indeed, like a mediæval curiosity, is still exercised, both by Romish and Reformed Papists. And while the Christian liberty of prophesying has been denied by an unchristian priesthood, so also has the duty of welcoming the pious teacher, and giving respectful heed to his "prophesyings," been supplanted by a suspicious distrust of all "prophesyings" which have not the accredited seal of conventional orthodoxy. The chief proportion of professing Christians in our times, in manifest violation of

the apostle's command, *despise* "prophesyings," as necessarily dangerous to the faith; "prove" nothing, instead of "all things;" and "hold fast" not only that which is good, but much that is false and mischievous. Now the Apostle Paul evidently believed that theology is not a fixed, but a progressive science,—and that faithful and spiritually minded teachers and students of God's word, as "scribes well instructed unto the kingdom, bring forth" occasionally from this "treasure, things *new* and *old*." He bids Christian disciples, therefore, *not* despise prophesying, for by so doing, they may be closing their eyes to the light of new truth: but "prove all things; and hold fast that which is good." But the modern church believes that its opinions about the teaching of the Bible cannot in any respect be wrong—although but two or three centures ago its forefathers were slumbering, amid the superstitions, and bound by the spiritual slavery of Rome; and since the new light of the Reformation dawned, has scarcely made any progress in divine truth,—but is constantly going back to that twilight era, to learn its doctrines, and fix its faith.

Was then the Reformation so complete, that progress beyond *that* point was impossible? Can any be so infatuated as to suppose that the deep-rooted and wide-spread errors of Popery were so eradicated *then* as not to leave some corrupt germs in their full vitality and vigor? That the Reformation should have been thus complete is not probable, for it would have been a remarkable exception to the universal experience of human progress.

Why, then, should our faith in the orthodoxy of the living *church* be so implicit as to foreclose every devoutly independent inquiry into the teaching of the living *word?* The voice of God's word calls loudly for another and more advanced reformation. Let us heed its voice, as the supreme dictator in matters of faith and obedience. It bids us come yet farther away from the deadly superstitions of Papal and Pagan Rome. It tells the Protestant church that it is even yet occupying, to some considerable extent, a common platform with the great Papal apostacy. The Protestant doctrine of the soul's human personality and capability of a separate state as an immortal being, is not of Scripture, but tradition—claiming its parentage in the heathen philosophy, and affording a broad foundation for many Popish errors. On this belief the church of Rome builds its worship of the Virgin Mary, its invocation of saints, its purgatory and indulgences. The Bible bids us give up this mere human conceit, and profess a more thorough Protestantism.

But this will be disputed: and the text at the head of this tract is the supposed grand authority for disputing this assertion. I ask, then, the inquirer's candid attention to the exposition of this stronghold of the popular doctrine.

"Therefore, we are always confident, knowing that whilst *we are at home in the body we are absent from the Lord.* We are confident, I say, and willing, rather *to be absent from the body*, and to be *present with the Lord.*"

It is readily allowed that this passage *seems* to teach the doctrine of the soul's separate state, and immediate felicity in that state. But this *apparent* instruction is to be attributed to the fact that such doctrines are so generally taught and accredited. Holding the traditional belief that the soul of man is his personality, and is capable of existing independently of the body, it is natural to put such a construction upon this text as that which it commonly obtains. But I cannot think that the believers in Corinth, who had read and understood the Apostle's first epistle, could have so interpreted his meaning. Such an interpretation would have been in direct contradiction to the very clear and cogent reasoning contained in the 15th chapter of their first epistle. Let the text under consideration be taken, not, as is generally the practice, *apart from*, but *in connection with*, its context. The intelligent inquirer will ask, 'Of what is the Apostle discoursing in this part of his epistle? Is it his object to prove the separate state and immortality of the soul? Because, if this be *not* the subject of which he is treating, then, although his language may be *made* to express such a doctrine, such a construction cannot be fairly placed on his words.' In the chapter preceding that whence our text is taken, the apostle alludes to the perilous nature of his mission as a Christian preacher—"We are troubled," he says, "on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed; always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus [that is, always resigned, like Jesus, to dying, in the fulfillment of duty], that the [obedient] life also of Jesus might be made manifest [imitated by us] in our body [or mortal life of probation]. For we which live are alway delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh. . . . . Knowing that He which raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us with you. . . . . For which cause we faint not." It must be apparent that the Apostle is here speaking of the encouragement which the well-grounded hope of a *resurrection from the dead* by Jesus Christ, gave him in the daily anticipation of losing his life in the preaching of the gospel. He knew that if his life were taken from him he should have another and more perfect life by means of resurrection. If it were not for this hope of rising from the dead, he would have no hope at all to sustain him in the prosecution of his perilous ministry. "Why stand we in jeopardy every hour," he asks this same church, in his first epistle, "*if the dead* rise not at all?" But he had this "living hope," and hence he commences the fifth chapter with a profession of strong faith in the survivance of mortality—*not* by living in a disembodied state, but by a resurrection from the dead in a new spiritual and immortal nature. "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Now he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the spirit. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: (for we walk by faith, not by sight:) we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent

from the body, and to be present with the Lord." The imagery—for the language is obviously figurative—is that of "an earthly house of this tabernacle," which is condemned to be "dissolved," and which was the Apostle's appropriate image to describe the mortality of the creature man. *Man*, the one complex being, is compared to an "*earthly house*," or "*tabernacle*," which will be "*dissolved*." Nothing is here said nor implied about an *immortal* and essentially *permanent* part of man, which in its own nature is independent of this general and complete *dissolution*, which is most unaccountable, as on the popular supposition this immortal part is the human personality. The believer is here taught that *he himself*, in his one totality, *not a part* of himself, must be "dissolved." But he knows that if *like* an "earthly house," he must crumble in dissolution, he will be restored again in the beauty and durability of a "building of God, a house not made with hands," but one that is "eternal in the heavens." Here the two states of the believer's existence are described by an "*earthly house*," or "*tabernacle*," which must dissolve, and "*a building of God, a house eternal* in the heavens."—According to the popular interpretation of this text, Paul should have said, "We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved,—if, that is, our body were to be put off in death,—*we have yet* WITHIN US *an imperishable soul or spirit which cannot be dissolved.*" But he does not say this,—he does not say that *we retain in ourselves* anything which survives the dissolution of the "earthly house of this tabernacle." What he says is, "If this present nature dissolves in death, we know that God has provided *another nature*, even an incorruptible and imperishable one—"a house eternal in the heavens"—which he will bestow upon us when he re-creates us by Christ Jesus at the resurrection." "We know," says Paul, that "we have [*not an immortal soul*, but] a BUILDING OF GOD; [*not an eternal soul* WITHIN but] *a house eternal* IN THE HEAVENS." Paul is undoubtedly speaking of the *two bodies*, or *conditions of human existence*, to which he alludes in the 15th chapter of the first epistle,—"There is a *natural body*, and there is a *spiritual body*;" and hence he says in the second verse, "For in this we groan, earnestly desiring *to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven.*" As if he had said, "While our bodily nature is under the power of dissolution we have no nature or being,—we in fact cease to be, and therefore, in the view of this dissolution, we groan for our new immortal nature—our house from heaven." The Apostle evidently desired to be "clothed upon" with an eternal house, when this tabernacle or temporary house was destroyed. He makes not the faintest allusion to any survivance of mortality as a disembodied soul. He groans to be *clothed upon*, as he also says in another epistle, [Rom. 8: 23,] "Even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, *the redemption of our body.*" "For we that are in this tabernacle [dwelling as mortal creatures] do groan, being burdened, *not for that we would be unclothed* [we desire not to die,] but CLOTHED UPON [with our eternal house from heaven, which is our resurrection nature], that *mortality might be swallowed up of life.*" "Therefore, we are always confident;" for we know that if on the one hand, as mortal beings, we must dissolve in death,—on the other hand, as beings upon whom God has conferred, through Christ, the gift of immortality, we shall, when we are raised from the dead and receive our spiritual natures, live again as immortal beings "eternal in the heavens." "We are always confident" of this, and know "that whilst we are at home in the body,"—whilst, that is, *we are existing as earthly tabernacles, mortal and perishable*, "we are absent from the Lord," with whom we cannot be until we have put off our mortality—because "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God,"—and have assumed our immortality; which will be when we are raised from the dead in our "spiritual body,"—our "building of God,"—our "house" which is "eternal in the heavens." "We are confident," I say, of so glorious a re-creation in Christ Jesus awaiting us; and are, therefore, "willing rather to be absent from the body," that is, from our "*natural body*,"—our present mortal and corruptible nature, which separates us from the Lord, and to be possessed of our "*spiritual body*," our new incorruptible nature,—in order "that we may be present with the Lord," which cannot be *until the resurrection*, when "mortality shall be swallowed up of life."

The Apostle desired to "be" present with the Lord, *not as a disembodied soul*, for he says, "*not* for that we would be *unclothed*;" and hence, in harmony with this desire, he says, "in this we groan earnestly, desiring to *be clothed upon* with our house which is from heaven;" and, therefore, since this "clothing upon," or *re-creation of the human nature* cannot take place *until the resurrection*, "when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality,"—his desire to "be *absent from the body and to be present with the Lord*," cannot be gratified, and he evidently did not expect it, from his reasoning, *until the dead in Christ shall rise in "the first resurrection.*"

So far, then, from inculcating the doctrine that at death the *soul* of the believer is present with the Lord, this text forms part of an important passage in the Apostle's writings, in which he exhibits an utter disregard of such a doctrine, and declares that his own *earnest longing was for the day of resurrection;* when being "absent from the body"—having, that is, *parted forever with his mortality*—he should possess his new immortal nature, in which he should behold, and be forever "present with the Lord."

I leave, then, the teacher of the popular doctrine to explain this remarkable fact, that here (as in the two places which we have previously considered,) the Apostle *says nothing of the blissful interval between death and resurrection—expresses no desire in reference to this interval;* but as if impatient of it, he *groans* and *earnestly desires* to be "clothed upon" with his "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." The conclusion is unavoidable, that the Apostle Paul knew of no such a state of intermediate blessedness for the soul; the consummation of his wishes is thus expressed—"*if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.*"—(Phil. 3: 11.)

Some, in their determination not to yield this, the citadel of their favorite dogma, endeavor to make something plausible of it by what is termed riding a metaphor to death. The figurative expression, "clothed upon," and "at home in," and "absent

from the body," it is alleged, must signify *something distinct* from the *clothing* and the *body*. *That* which is "clothed upon," and which is "at home in or absent from the body," is the *immortal soul*. Now this looks very specious; but admit it for the sake of argument, and it is obvious what a strange and unmeaning confusion of language the whole of this part of the chapter exhibits. Paul sets out with expressing the strong confidence which he and believers generally had in their triumph over mortality when they should receive their "building of God"—their "spiritual body"—their new condition of future life—which he had shown in the first epistle, will be bestowed at the resurrection. Groaning under the burden of a present mortality, he earnestly desires that the time may soon arrive when, possessed of his "spiritual body," "mortality shall be swallowed up of life." *Until* this clothing upon,—that is, *until the resurrection*,—it is obvious that *mortality reigns*,—it is *not* "swallowed up of life." But how does this instruction of Paul's agree with the popular belief that the *immortal soul* at death escapes from its prison-house of clay, and that at *this moment*

"There is a land of pure delight,
Where saints immortal reign"?

The Apostle is evidently at variance with the modern theology on this point, when he teaches that *not until* we are "*created* in Christ Jesus,"—invested with our "spiritual body,"—"clothed upon" by our "building of God,"—the grand result is accomplished, *mortality is swallowed up of life*.

Besides, on the supposition that the being "absent from the body" and "present with the Lord," refers to the immortal soul leaving its corporeal abode and ascending to God, how, I ask, does this statement follow as an *inference* from what the Apostle had been previously discoursing upon? Why does he preface it by a term which shows that it stands connected with the foregoing observations as a consequence, and say, "*Therefore*, we are always confident," &c? The substance of Paul's statement is that he earnestly desired the *arrival of resurrection*, that he might be possessed of his spiritual and immortal nature. What logical connection is there between this empathic desire, and the statement, that, when he died, his disembodied soul ascended to the presence of God? According to the exposition given above, the connection is obvious and natural; but such an exposition of the passage, the only possible one as it appears to me, gives a most decided contradiction to the doctrine which is so fondly and furtively reared upon it.

But further, if we are to understand that apparent *something* which is clothed upon to be the spiritual nature or soul, then the Apostle plainly avows that he had *no desire for this intermediate state*; for he says, "*Not* for that we would be *unclothed*." Even with this gloss, his longing is for the "*redemption of the body*" *at resurrection*. Let it be noted, that according to this exposition, Paul does not pass over in silence the popular notion of an intermediate state of bliss, as in the true exposition of the passage as given above; he is made to affirm that he *would rather not participate in it*; he does *not desire disembodied bliss*,—"*Not that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon*, that mortality might be swallowed up of life."

Once more, if it be affirmed that the imagery of being "clothed upon" represents the popular notion of the *soul* as *something within* which is "clothed upon" with its "earthly house" or "building of God," then consistency demands that the doctrine of the soul's incorruptibility and immortality be forthwith *discarded from the orthodox belief*; for it is written "*This corruptible* must *put on* incorruption, and *this mortal* must *put on* immortality." *This something within*,—*the soul*, must *put on incorruption and immortality*, and is *itself* called "*this corruptible*, and *this mortal*." "So *when this corruptible shall have put on* incorruption, and *this mortal shall have put on immortality*, *then* shall be brought to pass the saying that is written—Death is swallowed up in victory."

The attempt to evade the proper meaning of the Apostle's language, does but involve the disconcerted polemic in greater perplexities, and in the end lead to his being entangled and taken in his own net. Candor must compel the acknowledgment that the very prevalent custom of quoting this text of Paul's for the purpose of teaching that he expected to be with Christ immediately at death, is most unwarrantable; a very gross and mischievous perversion of his meaning.

The hope which the Bible bids the believer in Christ cherish is the Hope of Future Life by means of Resurrection from the dead. The great importance of the doctrine of the resurrection in the Christian religion is shown by St. Paul, when he says that "if the dead rise not, then *they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished*." And in one of his epistles he speaks of certain persons in his own age who denied the future resurrection, which denial, he says, "*overthrew the faith* of some." If there be no resurrection, then there is no intermediate consciousness for the dead in Christ; they "are *perished*:" and the denial of this doctrine was to altogether *overthrow* the Christian faith—because, if there be no future resurrection, then there is *no life after death*; no future life at all. Here, is at once apparent, how pernicious is the influence which the expectation of a state of bliss for the separate soul after death, has upon the doctrinal system of Christianity. The resurrection is comparatively forgotten, or at all events, is but little heeded by the Church of modern times. This great event is, by the general concurrence of Christian professors, regarded as *very remote, as far hence in the history of the human race*. In consequence, it has little practical influence upon the spiritual life of Christians, and is very rarely referred to in the modern so-called orthodox preaching. The reason is obvious, the church is anticipating *a preparatory glory for the separate soul*; and believing the *soul* to be essentially the human personality, it entertains but little thought about its companion in the grave.

Besides this, there is yet another and most serious evil resulting from, or at least fostered by, the unscriptural notion of the soul's separate state of happiness in death. The evil referred to is the general infidelity of the church on the subject of *Christ's Personal Advent as an event to be daily looked for and desired by the faithful*. Our Lord frequently urged his disciples to watch and wait for his coming, lest, coming suddenly, he should find them

sleeping, and not actively engaged in his service, and anticipating his arrival. The Apostolical epistles also exhibit the expectation of Christ's speedy coming as a grand motive to Christian faithfulness. When Christ comes again, it is to raise the dead Church to life, who will slumber in their graves, until they "shall hear his voice and come forth." The resurrection *depends upon the second advent of Christ*, who is "the resurrection and the life;" hence every Scriptural believer longs with Paul for the "redemption of the body," and that he may "attain unto the resurrection of the dead,"—and with John, utters the fervent prayer that his Lord may come quickly. "He which testifieth these things saith, "*Surely I come quickly.* Amen. Even so. COME LORD JESUS!"

NOTE 1.—Very much, indeed *all*, of the obscurity of the passage under consideration, arises from understanding what are evidently but *figurative* expressions in a strictly *literal* sense. The popular interpretation of this ill-used text owes all its value to this great mistake. Expositors insist upon the phrases "clothed upon," "absent from," "at home in," being understood as strictly literal expressions, and hence they speak of *that* which is "clothed upon;" *that* which is "absent from;" *that* which is "at home in." And this something they maintain is the *separate soul.* Now the language of our text adopts the imagery of *clothing*, as most common and familiar to the ancient Hebrews, and it is manifestly to do violence to a law of writing and speech, to take figurative expressions in a rigidly philosophical and literal sense. Being "clothed upon with our house which is from heaven," simply signifies becoming possessed of the spiritual or immortal nature, without any reference to the *manner* of the possession. And so also "to be absent from," and to be "at home in" the body, does not indicate the *manner*, but simply the *fact* of mortality, or superiority over it by being immortalized. In Peter's second epistle, ch. 1 : 18, the Apostle thus writes—"I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up, by putting you in remembrance; knowing that shortly I must *put off* this my tabernacle." On this passage the pious and learned Dr. Watts thus comments—"The soul or thinking principle of the Apostle Peter, which is here supposed to be himself, is so plainly distinguished from the tabernacle of the body, in which he dwelt for a season, and which he must '*put off*' shortly, and most evidently implies an existence of this thinking soul, very distinct from the body, and which will exist when the body is laid aside. Surely the conscious being and its tabernacle or dwelling place, are two very distinct things; and the conscious being exists when he puts off his present dwelling."—*Essay towards the Proof of a Separate State.* Here is an example of forcing a meaning out of the *figurative terms* by which a truth is illustrated; a method of interpretation which, if cast in a canonical form, the eminent Doctor would not for one moment have allowed. In proof of the incorrectness of the Doctor's exposition of the above passage, let the reader endeavor to interpret on his principle the following kindred texts,—"*Put ye on* the Lord Jesus Christ."—Rom. 13 : 14. "As many of you as have been baptised into Christ, have *put on* Christ."—Gal. 3 : 27. "Seeing that ye have *put off* the old man with his deeds, and have *put on* the new man."—Col. 3 : 9, 10. "*Put on*, therefore, ... bowels of mercies," &c. —Col. 3 : 12. "*Put on* Charity."—Col. 3 : 14. "He *put on* righteousness as a breast-plate, and a helmet of salvation upon his head; and he *put on* the garments of vengeance for clothing, and was clad with zeal as a cloak."—Isa. 59 : 17.

NOTE 2.—PROFESSOR HAGENBACH, summing up his historical sketch of the opinions of the Primitive Fathers on the soul and its immortality, thus writes,—"The whole question, however, had more of a *philosophical* than Christian bearing, as the idea of immortality itself is abstract-negative. On the other hand, the believer by faith lays hold of eternal life in Christ as something really existing. *The Christian doctrine of immortality cannot, therefore, be considered apart from the person, work, and kingdom of Christ, and must rest upon Christian perceptions and promises.*"—*History of Doctrines*, vol. 1., p. 153.

"BIBLE VS. TRADITION."

We give the following extract from this work, on which Bros. Ellis and Read have expended so much labor. It is taken from the "*Introduction*," and will give some idea of what may be expected in the work, and shows that "the Baptists," in this country, are doing well in trying to bring about a new translation of the Scriptures. Let them do it, and do it with all the helps in their reach. The views we hold will be strengthened by it, unavoidably.

REVISION OR NEW TRANSLATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

The following clearly ascertained facts will show the necessity for a more thorough revision, or for an entirely new translation of the Scriptures, *to supplant King James' version.* The common version at present in use, was printed A. D. 1611. The only printed editions of the Greek Testament, which were in existence at that time were, Cardinal Ximens, printed in A. D. 1514, Erasmus, 1516, Stephens, 1546, and Beza, 1563, and editions that were printed from these. Nearly the same may be said of the O. T. The authorized version *was not made from any edition whatever, uniformly.* It is a somewhat startling assertion, yet an unquestionable fact, that although we have by public authority, *a Standard English Version of the Bible*, yet there exists NO STANDARD HEBREW AND GREEK TEXT, *for the original of that version.* What is called "*The Received Text*," is the text of Erasmus, who revised the Latin Vulgate and compared it with the Greek Text. This edition was corrected by Stephens, Beza, and Elzivir, and was published by Elzivir, at Leydon, in Holland, A. D., 1624; that is, NOT *till thirteen years* AFTER the publication of the *Authorized Version.* In the compilation of his Text, Erasmus was only able to consult *eight recent manuscripts*, which manuscripts are now considered as of comparatively slight authority. These manuscripts were those marked 1, 2, 3, 61, and 69, and the MSS. 4, and 7,

were used in part of his text, and *only one* in Revelations, all of which were written *later than the 10th century*. The only manuscript from which he made up his text for Revelations, had several chasms, and because the last leaf was wanting, *he translated the Latin of the Vulgate* into Greek to supply these deficiencies. See March's Introduction, vol. 2, p. 846, and Penn's Annotations. Such is the origin of the Received Text. In these times the Reformation had not made sufficient progress to allow of the compilation of a correct Text.

The Received Greek Text, though compiled from eight comparatively modern manuscripts, *is unsupported by any one manuscript, ancient or modern*, and from recent developments, is now acknowledged to be the very worst Greek Text extant, in a printed form. Since its publication, between 600 and 700 manuscripts have been discovered, some of which are very ancient, and very valuable. The *best* is marked B, the *Cod. Vaticanes*, of the 4th and 5th centuries. The *second*, marked A, the *Cod. Alexandrinus*, of the 5th century. The *third*, marked C, *Cod. Ephrem*, about the 5th century, and the *fourth*, marked D, *Cod. Cantabujiensis*, of the 7th century. *The Received Text* has not received the benefits of these, nor of the editions and collations of Mill, Wetstein, Matthei, London Polyglott, Bengal, Griesback, Bently, Birch, Knapp, Lachman, Scholz, and Hahn, for the N. T., nor of many of the most celebrated collaters of the O. T.

The first translation of the Bible into English, was made by Wickliffe, *wholly from the Latin Vulgate*, in A. D., 1380. This forms the basis of *all* the English editions. *Tyndale* published his first edition in 1525. Between this and the Version of King James, in 1611, a period of only 86 years, *four successive revisions* were published by authority, as new stores of manuscripts were discovered; that is, one version was made on an average, every 22 years. Although in the 241 years since King James' Revision was made, a greater multitude of manuscripts, of greater value and authority than any before existing, have been discovered and collated, *yet no subsequent revision has been made by authority*. Still many will fondly cling to the common version, with all its errors and corruptions, and thereby help to conceal the precious truths which the providence of God has brought to light, and placed within the reach of the learned; but which are shamefully withheld from the community.

We are aware that sectarianism would suffer considerably from a correct translation. But what of that? The gain to the cause of truth and righteousnes would gloriously compensate. Indeed it may be set down as an axiom, that when the Scriptures are purposely corrupted to sustain any doctrine, that doctrine is presumptively false. No lover of truth tries to conceal her from himself. The "*Bible Union*" have convicted our translation of 20,000 errors, some indeed of small consequence. But the Scriptures have been purposely corrupted to sustain the doctrines of the "immortality of the soul," "the separate conscious existence of the spirit of man," "the eternal misery of the wicked," &c., as we shall make abundantly manifest in the forthcoming pages. Sometimes whole stories have been introduced, probably the opinion of the transcribers, to embellish. Such are,—The woman taken in adultery; The descent of the angel to trouble the waters of Bethesda; The bloody sweat of our Saviour, and the angel strengthening him; and, The conversion of the dying thief upon the cross; all of which are supposed to be spurious. But, perhaps the worst of all these corruptions, is the transposition and omission of clauses of the verses in Mat. chap. 27, to conceal the essential fact, that Christ was truly slain by his enemies. The reading of the best manuscripts is, 50 v. "They offered him vinegar: but another going to him, pierced his side with a spear; and Jesus crying with a loud voice, expired." This passage of the piercing of Christ *prior to his death*, was condemned *as late as the 14th century*, by Popes Clement 5th and his successor John, because it conflicted with some of their notions respecting the Trinity. This shameful perversion is sufficient alone to condemn every edition in which it is contained.

Seemingly the best course now to be pursued, would be to adopt the principle of criticism recommended by Dr. Johnson, "*For restoring the correct text of all ancient writings, whether profane or sacred.*" "Take the *most ancient copy* for the standard; to correct by authority, wherever it can be found; and to resort to conjecture, only where authority is absolutely and altogether wanting; observing always to hold a most rigid medium between presumption and timidity; by the former of which, we induce error upon truth, and by the latter, we consent to remain forever under the dominion of error, and in the power of chance, ignorance, or artifice."

This is the principle that has been adopted by Penn in his revision of "The New Covenant." He has chosen the entire text of the most ancient surviving manuscript, and which is likewise the most free from those interlineations and alterations, that disfigure and render suspicious, other manuscripts: This one is The Codex Vaticanus, or celebrated Vatican MS. noted 1209 in the Vatican catalogue at Rome, and marked B. by Wetstein, making it the basis and substance of his revision.

"THE FULFILMENT OF PROPHECY: or a Prophetic History of the World; including a few suggestions on the probable termini of the Chronological Periods. By F. H. Berick and J. Couch."

Such is the title of a pamphlet of some 140 pages, sent us, we presume, by the authors. We have only had time to glance at its pages. We commend the *spirit* in which they have written. So far as we discover, it is free from that denunciatory spirit that condemns all who do not see with them. We are glad to find they see, what we were condemned for maintaining seven years ago, that the Mahomedan power is clearly brought to view in the Prophecy of Daniel. We do not know that we should apply to that power all they do; but that it is clearly revealed there we have had no doubt for seven years. That Michael is Jesus Christ we do not believe; but we have no room to argue that point now, and our views of it may be found in the Examiner for '48, page 60. That the Austrian power

is the head "*healed*"—having been "wounded to death"—we doubt; though that may be true, possibly. That the Austrian Imperial is the "*short space*" dynasty, we do not credit. That it is the beast that ascendeth from the bottomless pit, or abyss, we have no faith in; or that that power is the beast on which the woman—*the harlot*—sitteth when she goes to judgment, we cannot credit with facts so clearly developed in another direction. The present Napoleon Dynasty looks much more like the *healed* head—though we do not say it is—and we are quite sure that Catholics in France and in Europe, generally, regard Louis Napoleon as the grand defender and supporter of the Catholic church, as such they extol, honor, and worship him.

In the view of definite time, *for the advent*, they advocate, we do not agree; though we are happy to say, they have expressed themselves upon it in a commendable spirit. We would be glad to see all writers on that subject manifest a like spirit: then should we have less bigotry and denunciation. Some who take the definite time theory denounce all who do not see as they do, and manifest anything but the spirit of the lowly Jesus. On a subject where so many mistakes have occurred surely modesty is becoming.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, JANUARY, 1853.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—We now enter upon the *Eighth Volume* of our paper. The first two volumes were published at irregular intervals, from 1842 to 1847, and in the quarto form. January, 1848, we commenced it in its present octavo form, at fifty cents per year. The receipts, at that price, fell short of paying the printer's bill, and there was but one alternative, either to discontinue the paper or increase the price to one dollar. By the advice of friends we did the latter. This course has kept the paper alive, and for the last two years has paid the cost of the printing and given its editor about $200 per year for his labor in editing and mailing; all of which he has performed with his own hands for lack of funds to employ others. The number of paying subscribers has not exceeded about six hundred; though we have sent off, regularly, between seven and eight hundred copies. Our friends can easily see that we have to economize to get along at this rate; and we have no "*Association*" to sustain, or beg for us, if unable to go on ourself. Our terms are payment *in advance* in all cases. We have, however, never refused sending to any one who has informed us that he was poor—wished the paper—but could not pay for it at present. We have sent to numbers of such. Some of them have afterwards paid for it—others have not. We never send bills, nor *duns*. If we send you the paper without its having been paid for in advance, you need have no fear that we shall dun you for it. All papers are discontinued at the end of the year unless the advance pay has been sent; or with very rare exceptions.

If our number of paying subscribers could be increased to fifteen hundred, we would publish the Examiner twice each month, *without increasing the price*; as it is, we cannot.

We can still furnish complete sets of the Examiner, *in sheets*, from 1849. The volume for '48 is exhausted. For '49, the price is fifty cents. For '50 and '51 the same, per volume; or $1,50 *bound* in one volume. On the bound volume, 25 cents will be discounted to paying subscribers for 1853. Paying subscribers for '53 may have the volume for '52, in sheets, for 75 cents. None of '52 have been bound, and probably none will be unless specially called for.

The Examiner will be conducted as heretofore, with special reference to its *motto*—"No Immortality, nor Eternal Life, except through Christ alone." We shall occasionally speak on other topics, but this is the leading theme to which our paper is devoted. The passing events in Europe have led us to throw out a few hints in this number, the value of which our readers will judge for themselves.

PATRONS AND FRIENDS.—We feel greatly obliged for the prompt manner in which many have responded to our call for early remittances for the present volume; and that their letters come with so many expressions of satisfaction and profit. We presume those expressions were intended for our *private use*, and we so appropriate them; even though it might be pleasant to others to share in them. We seek no public commendation; and where it has appeared, in other papers, it has been unsought by us, and a cause of humiliation, from a consciousness of unworthiness. We intend, through grace, to do that which we believe God and Truth demand of us. When that is done, it is often with so much imperfection that it gives us cause to mourn instead of exultation. "Brethren *pray for us*." May the Lord bless and comfort you all.

VISITING ABROAD.—It may be thought strange by some, why we should go a long distance—say to Buffalo, or other places as distant—and return home so soon. Why not, to save expense, visit several other places at the same time? Our an-

swer is a plain one—We have no one at home who can attend to our monthly issue of the Examiner, or answer our letters and orders for Books, Tracts, &c. We have not the means of employing any one to do this. Bro. Young, in whose Book Store we keep our office, very kindly waits upon those who call *personally* for works in our absence; but the pressure of his own business forbids his undertaking any more. Consequently, all letters sent have to remain unanswered till we return from abroad; hence to remain away more than over two Sabbaths at once, we cannot; unless we conclude to let our office and paper go to ruin. As it is, when we return, we sometimes feel almost at our wit's end to know what to do first.

If there was an income from the paper and office that would enable us to employ an *interested* person to take charge in our absence, it would be otherwise. My son, who is competent and willing, would have done this work for me; and on him might have been laid much of the burden which is now borne alone; but the lack of means has prevented this, and he has been compelled to seek employment in another city. Separated thus from him, all falls upon his father's shoulders, relating to the office and paper. We trust this reply will satisfy all.

———o———

"BIBLE VS. TRADITION."—The cost of the first edition of this work, if published, cannot vary much from $400. The pledges to aid, hitherto, have amounted to only about $60. We offered to risk *one-half* the whole amount necessary to publish it; and promised to return the funds furnished by others, if they desired it, so soon as the sales should amount to the cost of the first edition of one thousand. The help we ask amounts to a *loan*, with the risk of losing it, provided the work does not sell. But even then we will give you the books in payment at the actual cost of the edition. More than this we cannot promise. We believe the work will sell for enough to pay the cost: others may think differently. It is for those who have the funds to say whether it shall be published. We still wait to hear from them, believing that we have now discharged our duty in the matter.

———o———

"REVIEWER REVIEWED: *A Dialogue;* Being a Reply to Eld. J. G. Stearns, on the 'Immortality of the Soul,' by Geo. Storrs."

This work is now ready for delivery. It is a pamphlet of 36 pages, 18 mo. Price, *six cents* single copy; $4 per 100. The matter of it will not be published in the Examiner. It has been gotten up by special request in a pamphlet. The expense has been considerable in preparing and publishing it. We hope our friends will see that we are not pecuniary losers thereby. We trust they may think it worth scattering.

———o———

POSTAGE.—The Examiner is subject to only *half* cent postage within the State of New York. Neither is it any more to a subscriber out of this State, *provided* the postage is paid *quarterly in advance;* and it is not necessary to do this, as was at first supposed, at the office where mailed, but may be done at your own Post Office.

Those who order Tracts sent by mail, should take at least *eight ounces;* otherwise *each* tract is subject to the same postage as if it weighed three ounces. If eight ounces are taken, and the postage *pre-paid*, they are chargeable half a cent only, per ounce. Do not forget this.

All pamphlets under three ounces go for one cent each, if *pre-paid.* This includes the "Six Sermons," 18 mo., and the "Unity of Man, by Anthropos;" which weigh only three ounces each. Another cent is added when not *pre-paid.*

Bound books are one cent per ounce, when *pre-paid;* or one cent and a half if not. We hope our friends will scatter much seed this year in the fields which wait for cultivation.

———o———

THE FRENCH EMPIRE.

The re-establishment of the *Napoleon Dynasty* in France, has opened a new chapter in prophecy, as clearly marking the time in which we live, as any event in modern history. The prophecy relating to this scene is found chiefly in Revelation 17th chapter.

In the prophecies of Scripture a *beast* is the symbol of a *Dynasty*, or *Body of Rulers.* It does not include the *ruled*, or subjects. To suppose this is to destroy the harmony of prophecy. The same dynasty may be, and sometimes is, symbolized by different beasts. The seventh and eighth chapters of Daniel are presented in proof of this. It is not our object now to enter further into that argument, but to show that the Napoleon Dynasty is symbolized in Rev. 17, and then briefly suggest its mission in this present development.

At the opening of that chapter one of the angels having the seven last plagues, called John to view the position the great harlot occupied when she was going to *judgment;* and he beheld her seated on a scarlet-colored beast, having seven heads and ten horns. That this harlot represents the Papal Dynasty, we shall not now stop to argue, as we consider that point long since settled. The corrupt body of rulers of that corrupt church appear sup-

porting their power by taking refuge on the civil dynasty that is described by a scarlet-colored beast. The description of that beast shows it to be a dynasty differing from any previous one. The Dragon, Rev. 12, has seven heads and ten horns, but has *crowns* on his *heads*. The first beast, Rev. 13, has the same number of heads and horns, but has the *crowns* on his *horns*. The beast in the 17th chapter appears with the same number of heads and horns, but no mention is made of any crowns; and yet it is shown to have a family relation by the *seven heads*.

The peculiarities of this beast are, that it is "the *eighth*, and is *of* the seven"—that "*it was, is not*, and YET IS;" and that *it is*, by ascending out of the *abussou*—the *abyss*. It had been in power—that power for a time *is not;* then, suddenly, it ascends from its non-existence and appears to the *wonder* of all except those whose names were in the book of life; that is, of all except the followers of Christ, for whose special benefit the prophecy was given; and who by a careful attention to the words of Christ are enabled to see the approaching consummation in the accuracy of the events fulfilling the prophecy.

In the information the angel gave John, he says, v. 10—"There are seven kings"—forms of government, or dynasties—"five are fallen, one is, the other is not yet come; and when he cometh he must continue *a short space*."

That these seven dynasties are all *Roman*, we believe, is nearly the universal belief of Protestant Christendom. The *sixth*, that was in power at the time John had the vision, was the Roman *Imperial*. Five forms of Roman government had fallen prior to that time. The *Imperial* was the one then reigning, and was to continue till "the short space" dynasty should arise.

We find the Imperial did continue down to 1806. After it was darkened in the western Roman Empire, just previous to the rise of Papacy, it still continued in the eastern, at Constantinople, till 1453. Before it fell in the east, it had been revived in the west, in the person of Charlemagne, A. D., 800; and continued unbroken in the Emperors of Germany or Austria till overthrown by Napoleon Bonaparte in 1806.

At this point we look for the "short space," or "seventh" dynasty. Accordingly we find Napoleon proclaimed Emperor of France and King of Italy; and assuming to be the *successor* of the Cæsars. Thus the seventh is developed. "It *was*"—but soon, "*it is not;*" and the world supposed it had disappeared forever. But, before forty years pass away, an "eighth" appears from the *abyss*, to the *wonder* of the world; but this eighth is not another dynasty—it "is *of* the seven;" it is the same that "*was*"—then "*is not*"—and "yet *is*."

Nothing could be more accurate in its fulfillment than the prophecy in the Napoleon Dynasty; and when Louis Napoleon entered Paris on his return from his tour through France, to prepare the way for the proclamation of the Empire, some of the sentiments inscribed on the banners that graced his entry into the city, were such as this—"The uncle that *was*—the nephew that *is*." Thus employing the very words of the prophecy, though unknowingly to themselves.

For a time this dynasty "*is not*." When Napoleon I. abdicated, he did so in favor of his own son, Napoleon II. But that son never came to power—he "*is not*" a reigning portion of the dynasty: and the dynasty, itself, for near forty years, "*is not*." It then "ascended from the abyss," and now "*it is*"! Thus far all seems plain.

We next remark—That in ascending from the abyss, one of the first acts of the beast is to receive the great harlot to *sit* upon him. She takes her seat there just as the "*judgment*" is about to be executed upon her. Here again history and prophecy harmonize. The Papal power was driven from Rome, and was not likely to recover its seat. But the ascending beast sent his *republican* [!] armies to Italy, and the harlot takes her seat on, or by means of, that scarlet-colored beast, where she now *sits;* because, as yet, Louis Napoleon knows it is for his interest to let her *sit* upon—not guide—his dynasty. So long as he can use her for his own aggrandizement so long will he consent to let her *sit* as she does.

Thus far the fulfillment seems perfect; but we now approach the future. Here all we can do is to trace the outlines. There seems clearly to be "*ten* kings"—or small dynasties—who are to be united to the beast by a voluntary giving "their power and strength to the beast," v. 13. These are most likely to be the ten States or Principalities of Italy; who, from some motive of policy, will unite their interest with the Napoleon Dynasty; after which, by some means, or from some cause not yet developed, "the beast with the horns," [so the Syriac reads,] will come in collision with the harlot, and "eat her flesh, and burn her with fire." Let the Papal or Harlot power attempt to put bits in the mouth of this beast, or to restrain his ambition, and she will soon find she has been riding to judgment, and her destruction is certain and final.

Another event in the history of this dynasty and its horns is, they will "make war on the Lamb": consequently this "*short space*" dynasty will con-

tinue in power till the Lamb shall return to claim the kingdoms of this world. That war is briefly spoken of in the conclusion of the 17th chapter, with the emphatic declaration—"The Lamb shall overcome them." The 19th chapter speaks of this war more in detail, and after describing "the armies in heaven," that followed the Lamb, John proceeds to say—"I saw the beast [the Napoleon Dynasty] and the kings [the *ten* kings] of the earth [who had given their power to the beast] and their armies gathered together to make war against him that sat upon the horse [viz., the Lamb,] and against his army."

Thus the battle is set in array—the war commences—tremendous scenes open—a conflict that is to decide the government of this world. Is this not a matter of interest to all? What is to be the result? The prophecy does not leave us in doubt—"The Lamb shall overcome them"; chap. 17: 14;—"The beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him. * * * These both were cast alive into a lake of fire and brimstone"; chap. 19: 20. The 17th chapter had said, v. 11, he "goeth into perdition"—is *destroyed.* The 20th chapter tells us this is done when he makes war on the "King of kings and Lord of lords." Then he—that is—this dynasty—goeth into perdition, or is destroyed, and that destruction is final.

Now, whether all these things will take place under Napoleon III.—the present reigning Emperor in France—we will not pretend to say—the events yet undeveloped must determine that. But this we must say, If we have given the right application of the prophecy—and of this we see no reason to doubt—then the Napoleon *Dynasty* will not pass away till all these things be fulfilled; and as it is to be a "short space" dynasty, it does not seem likely that many years more can be allotted to it. If, however, the present Emperor of France is to be succeeded by others of the same family, it will not alter the general features of the prophecy; we are manifestly fast approaching the world's crisis; and the most astonishing events will, most likely, soon burst upon the world, which will cause the hearts of many to fail them with fear and consternation.

Much more might be said upon this subject; and we have by no means exhausted it. All we have aimed to do is, to throw out hints to call attention to prophecy as connected with passing events: this we feel bound to do as a watchman. As to fixing upon particular days or years for the accomplishment of all these things, we have no hand in it; and we are fully settled that all such calculations are injurious in their tendency, and calculated to throw the mind from that calm and sober waiting for the Lord, which ought ever to control and govern us, if we would be preserved from wild fanaticism.

Let us remember, the night is far spent—the day is at hand. Let us watch and keep ourselves unspotted from the world, walking in the footsteps of our blessed Lord and Life-giver, Jesus the Messiah; that when He who is *our life* shall appear, we also may appear with him in glory.

Beloved reader, let us not forget that this present life is of infinite value to us; because, if improved as God has enjoined and commanded, we may gain an *unending* life. May none of the cares, anxieties, pursuits or perplexities of this present time lead us to neglect the great and glorious prize of Immortality, Incorruptibility, Eternal Life; which can only be secured by a living union with Christ, the heavenly appointed Life-giver. May the Spirit of God be shed on us through him, that we may be aided to walk in the truth, and be made partakers of Everlasting Life thereby.

FROM H. H. DOBNEY.

MAIDSTONE, ENGLAND,
Sept. 22, 1852.

MY DEAR SIR:—Having an opportunity of sending by a young man (formerly a member of our church, but now for these few years resident in the United States, home on a visit but about to return,) I gladly avail myself of it to send you a few lines. And first of all let me account for a long seeming negligence, which I fear may have caused you to put my name into your black-book. The truth is, that toward the end of last year, I was kept for a long time in a state of considerable anxiety by a painful interruption of my dear wife's health. Then, in Dec., 1851, I had a most violent influenza, from which I never thoroughly recovered, though I still kept on preaching as usual, till a second attack of the same complaint, and then a third prostrated me exceedingly, and at length was obliged to give up all labor entirely, even the slightest, through utter inability; the case being so much the more serious from my having been obliged to labor on for some months in spite of nature's remonstrances. From the end of March till far into July, I was under physicians, and moved about from place to place; and when at length, by the kind hand of God upon me, I was once more permitted the honor and pleasure of publicly proclaiming the truth as it is in Jesus, why, as you will readily conceive, a large amount of things had accumulated which required all my attention. Through mercy I am pretty well, and conduct all my usual services—though I am

still compelled to be very careful. I hope you are enjoying the blessing which for some time I was deprived of, and that you have the happiness of seeing some of the seed you sow spring up and bring forth fruit.

In reference to the subject which first made us known to each other, it has sometimes occurred to me to inquire (if I could do it with sufficient delicacy,) whether there is no danger of one's looking too exclusively at one truth or set of truths, or looking at the rest too much from one point of view? How varied are the contents of the four Gospels, and of the apostolic letters. Nothing of the cuckoo note there, my friend, is there? Is not Christianity larger than what is technically (at least with *us*) called "the gospel"? Our Robert Hall characterized Hyper-Calvanism (which some years ago was a fearful curse among our churches,) as a system "which every skull would hold, and every tongue could tell"; and thus characterizing, condemned it. Is there no danger, lest Christians, who imagine they bring to light some truth lost sight of, should thrust that one truth, or class of truths, into undue prominence, and so spoil the beautiful proportions and symmetry of Truth? But perhaps you have not felt yourself in any danger of partiality for any new portion of truth, but are consciously bent on the mightly all, the complete circle. God bless you in all your labors.

I am yours faithfully,

H. H. Dobney.

Note by Editor of Examiner.—We are glad to hear from Bro. Dobney once more, but regret to learn of his long affliction. May the Lord abundantly sustain him in all his ways.

Since the date of his letter we are informed, by the "young man," who was the bearer of it, that Bro. Dobney has received the appointment of Director of the Colony at Australia, and has sailed for that place. We hope still to be favored with more from his pen.

We feel as painfully as he can the danger of having the mind so exclusively directed to some neglected truth as to overlook the general truths of the Bible; yet we are fully settled that unless we start right, as to what man is, there is no possibility of arriving at a clear understanding of the great scheme of Redemption, or to inspire the Hope of the Gospel. And while so few are engaged in exhibiting *immortality only through Christ*, we feel called to make and keep that subject *prominent*.

"A Catechism, Designed as a Guide to a proper understanding of the Lord's Prayer, for the use of Sabbath-Schools, Bible Classes, and Families. By J. Lenfert."

Such is the title of a neat little work put into our hands by the author. From the subject, and the arrangement of the work we should judge it would be a valuable help in the departments for which it was designed. It is 18 mo.,108 pages; got up in a good and attractive style. Price, *in cloth binding*, 15 cents; or 1,65 per dozen. *Stiff binding*, 25 cents; or $2,65 per doz. Twenty-five per cent discount by the hundred. For sale by R. T. Young, 140 Fulton-st, New York,—by Wm. A. Hall, 22 School-st., Boston; and by the author, Machias Porte, Me.

GOOD NEWS.

West Winsted, Conn., Dec. 13, 1852.

Bro. Storrs:—Our meetings are *very* interesting in this region, and several have lately embraced the *blessed* hope of life through Christ *alone*, with the expectation of *soon* being gathered by the angels, to Mount Zion, to behold the king in his beauty.

The prayer-meeting at my house last Sabbath evening was thought to be the best they had ever enjoyed. Two were converted, and seemed determined to hold out to the end. Our Monday praying meetings are comforting to the lone pilgrims.

Bro. Mathewson and myself have been laboring in Bridgeport for some days, and the good Lord has greatly blessed the people. Sinners have been converted, backsliders reclaimed, and saints made joyful in the house of the Lord. Nine have been baptized, and more intend to be next Sabbath. One who was a Methodist preacher, has embraced the faith in connection with his wife, daughter, and son-in-law, and are now happier than ever in the Christian religion, having withdrawn from the church in company with others.

In West Haven, we held some meetings, and several were baptized into Christ, and are striving to enter in at the staight gate. A Methodist minister embraced the faith at this place also, and is rejoicing in the freedom of Christ, expecting deliverance *soon*.

A Macedonian cry comes from almost every direction. It seems as though the famine for hearing the word of the Lord has commenced. Truth is spreading praise the Lord.

Last Wednesday evening I was at Hitchcockville, and at the close of the meeting, six rose for prayers, besides several professors.

Three weeks ago last Sabbath, we had a *very* interesting time in North Canton. A brother of Bishop Hamblin, who has been an exhorter, gave me this text, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment," &c., with the request that he might ask questions during the sermon. I complied. Many anxious ones came to hear, and the good Lord helped his servant, in preaching the truth.

Bro. Hamblin, (I call him brother because he has since embraced the faith he then questioned,) asked

several questions, among others, "How one could be punished when he was dead"?

I had been showing that "the wages of sin is death," and I asked him if *death* was a punishment? He said, "Yes." I then asked him if eternal death was eternal punishment? This was a hard question, and seemed to satisfy *him* as well as many *others*.

The Lord is reviving his work in that place, and the saints are happy in God.

TURNED TO FABLES.

NORWALK, OHIO.

BRO. STORRS:—The following extract I copy from a very handsomely bound book, containing some 300 pages, called, "*The Moral Probe*," by "J. Carroll Judson, of the Philadelphia Bar," which expresses in strong and definite language, the orthodox theology, of the last degenerate days, upon the subject of man's fancied natural immortality.

P. ALLING.

"DEATH."

"Death is the crown of life,
Death wounds to cure! we fall, we rise, we reign."
YOUNG.

"The thought of meeting the king of terrors is made unwelcome by most of the human family. Even the Christian is prone to treat the subject unkindly, until he is compelled to approach this *grim monster*, and as the acquaintance increases, the insatiate *devourer* of the body loses his deformity, and in the end proves himself a real friend. We should all make the acquaintance of this, our final *deliverer*, voluntarily and at once. Treat *death as our enemy*, and unkindly leave him to force himself upon us at the last hour! How cruel. *Treat death as an enemy! How ungrateful, unwise, and imprudent.* Is he an enemy, who transfers us from delusive dreams, from the region of bubbles and corroding cares, to a region where all is pure, substantial, enduring joy and endless felicity? It is a libel on DEATH to call him our foe, a king of terrors, an enemy. Frail man comes into the world crying, cries on through life, and is always seeking after some desired thing, which he imagines is labled *Happiness;* or is mourning over some loss which makes him miserable; a restless mortal, with an immortal soul which requires something more than earth can give to satisfy its lofty desires; the soul that hails death as the welcome messenger to deliver it from its ever-changing, ever-decaying prison-house of clay, called man; on which times wages a perpetual war; whitening locks, furrowing his cheeks, stealing his ivory, weakeniug his nerves, paralizing his muscles, poising his blood, battering the whole citadel, deranging the whole machinery of life, and wasting the mental powers, until he become twice a child; and then delivers him over to his last, best friend, DEATH, who breaks the carnal bondage, sets the imprisoned spirit free, closing a toilsome career of infelicity; opening the door of immortal happiness, returning the soul to its own original and glorious home, to go no more out forever. Not to become familiar with death is to endure much unnecessary fear, and add to the myriads of other imaginary woes of human life. For the Christian, death has no real terrors—all who are wise are Christians.

NOTE BY EDITOR.—If a man had of set purpose undertaken to ridicule the Bible, and turn the counsel of God into foolishness, we should expect he would indulge in such strains as the foregoing. Its blasphemy will be sufficiently apparent to all the readers of the Examiner. "The wages of *sin* is death." In speaking of the resurrection of those who sleep in Christ, Paul saith, that when Jesus comes from heaven, their "*last enemy—death*—shall be *destroyed.*" See 1 Cor. 15. The foregoing fable says, expressly, man's "*last* BEST FRIEND" is "DEATH"! Thus giving Paul and the Bible the lie! Behold where this fable of an immortal soul in man leads its defenders. The article needs no further comment; its shows its paternity on its face.

IMMORTAL SOUL.

OBJECTIONS TO THAT NOTION.

First. It introduces into the Christian world the mischievous practice of mystifying and spiritualizing God's plain words.

Second. It involves its subjects in almost impenetrable darkness or fog.

Third. It brings into existence from this system of spiritualism and mysticism a multiplicity of conflicting creeds.

Fourth. It is the origin of the Roman Catholic purgatory; a system of speculation.

Fifth. It substantially sustains and disseminates the Serpent's first lie.

Sixth. It runs its adherents into the inhuman, irrational, inconsistent, and monstrous dogma of *eternal torture!*

Seventh. It is the very *bone, sinew,* and *foundation* of the doctrine of universalism, and all going home to heaven above at death.

Eighth. It sustains Swedenborgianism—the theory of the great clairvoyant, A. J. Davis—and the spirit rappings, or manifestations.

Ninth. It is a very prolific source of Infidelity, Bigotry, and Superstition.

Tenth. It robs the blessed Christ of the honor due him of giving the dear saints the rich reward of the Kingdom, Immortality, Life Eternal, the unfading Crown, the eternal weight of glory, and every other blessing connected with the coming of Christ.

Eleventh. It subverts the gospel plan of Salvation given to us by the Son of God, who is its author.

Twelfth. It supersedes the necessity of the coming of Christ to raise the dead, to sit on David's throne, to judge the world in righteousness, and restore all things spoken of by the holy prophets.

Thirteenth. It makes God and his Son Jesus Christ the most cruel, hard-hearted, vindictive, tyrannical beings in the universe.

Fourteenth. It obliges its advocates to wrest the Scriptures and array themselves against the Pat-

riarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and Jesus Christ, who are the foundation of the whole Christian superstructure. A. N. SEYMOUR.

"SOUL'S UNDER THE ALTAR."

BY PRES. J. P. WEETHEE.

"And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held; And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?"—Rev. 6: 9–11.

This passage is urged by the mass of popular Christian professors, in favor of the conscious state of the dead. They affirm them to be *disembodied* souls of the martyred saints.

I deny the existence of DISEMBODIED SOULS. But admitting their existence, I deny those named in the text, to be such. Of the two following propositions I deny the first and affirm the second.

I. THEY ARE NOT DISEMBODIED SOULS.

II. THEY ARE DEAD SAINTS, WHO WERE MARTYRED UNDER THE PAPAL PERSECUTIONS.

I. THEY ARE NOT DISEMBODIED SOULS.

1. *Because it would leave the fifth epoch as far as this earth's affairs are concerned a* BLANK. The seals symbolize consecutive events, extending from the Apostolic age to the coming of Christ. It is admitted that the first four seals denote four epochs succeeding each other, and that the agents noticed under each, performed their agencies in those eras to which they belong in vision; and also, that these agents and their acts belong to the earth. They also admit that the events of the sixth seal belong to the earth; the popular interpretation makes the transactions of the fifth seal, an exception. They thus leave a blank during the era of the Papal persecutions, the period the most interesting to the evangelise and to the church general. Their interpretation is, therefore, defective in this particular point.

They suppose this altar under which they appear, to be the golden altar before the throne of God in heaven. This view is wholly incorrect. It is the altar erected on the earth amid blood and carnage.

2. *Their condition differs too much from that of other saints.* The four "living creatures," and the "four and twenty elders," of Rev. 4th and 5th chapters: also the messengers of Rev. 19: 10 and 22: 8, represent saints redeemed from the earth; and some of them officiating as assistant priests during the High Priesthood of Christ, as appears from their song:—"And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof, for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God, by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation: and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth." And in Rev. 8: 2–5 we have described some of their acts. From the song, above noticed, we conclude that these were redeemed from the human race, between the crucifixion of Christ, and the advent and kingdom of the Messiah. We conclude that they were of those who "come out of their graves" after the resurrection of the Saviour. We do not read of their returning again to the tombs. Moreover, it was necessary that there should be such a company in order to be assistant priests during the high priesthood of Christ.

3. *They are unhappy.* "They *cry*," "How long, O Lord, holy and true." But "In thy presence there is fullness of joy, and at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore." These are not in that state. Listen, also, to the ascriptions of praise from the four living creatures, and the four and twenty elders: And they must be of this company, if they are of the human race. See Rev. 7: 9.

4. *Their location contradicts the idea,—"under the altar."* The golden altar is in heaven, where the living creatures and four and twenty elders are officiating with the great High Priest and assistant priests. This is not the scenery temple nor altar. The events of the other seals will not allow this scenery to be located in heaven.

5. *The spirit of their cry forbids the idea*:—"Wilt thou not judge and avenge our blood." The former things are not forgotten. It is the same cry uttered by the living in Luke 18: 7. "And shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them"?

6. *Their white robes forbid the idea.* They have *white robes* only; no "*palms in their hands*," which are symbols of victory over death, which will appear by comparing Rev. 7: 9, with 1 Cor. 15: 55, 56.

7. *Their position in Rev.* 7: 9, 17, and 20: 4–6, *forbid it.* In Rev. 7: 9, 17, they stand before God with PALMS in their hands, symbols of victory. In chap. 20: 4, they have crowns, and reign with Christ. Their position in our text, and in these passages, are wholly unlike.

II. THEY REPRESENT THE SAINTS WHO WERE MARTYRED IN THE PAPAL PERSECUTIONS.

1. *They agree in Chronology.* The seals are consecutive. They form a chronological chain of seven links. We divide the period covered by the seals, into SEVEN EPOCHS. We locate the first four seals, and also the sixth, and in this manner ascertain the era of the fifth seal, viz., from somewhere near A. D., 540 to 1530. This is the epoch of the Papal persecutions.

2. *Their location agrees with our view.* John was commanded, saying, "*Write the things which must be hereafter.*" Those things were to be located on the earth. The book of seven seals contains a view of those things, and all those events were located on the *Roman earth*, if the events of this seal do not form an exception. That they do not, we urge the following:—1. The Court here named, was that which was left to the Gentiles; Rev. 11: 2; Lk. 21: 24. 2. The altar was one of Papal Roman sacrifice, and was located in that Court. 3. They were in that *Court* which was under the control of that altar, or Papal worship. 4. That Court was the scene of their death, which was under the control of that altar.

III. THE SYMBOLS HERE BROUGHT TO VIEW, SHOW THEIR LOCATION NOT TO BE IN HEAVEN.

The first symbol is the Gentile Court, then the altar. After that then the souls under the altar. John has a view of the Altar Court. He sees the mock high priest, in the person of the pope, and assistant priests officiating before the altar. He then beholds multitudes fall before their cruel per-

secutions; before the altar they lie, and as the blood of Abel cried to God, so are these represented as crying to the Divine Being for vengeance, or as all the creatures in Rev. 5: 13. They had presented their testimony as faithful witnesses, and for that faithful testimony they had fallen. White *robes* are given them. These robes symbolize their righteousness in death. They are not in the presence of God, but on the territory of their slaughter. It is a period of rest in the dust of the earth, it was said unto them, "that they should rest for a little season." Time rolled on and still they rest. The trumpet at length sounds, and they spring into being. They triumph over death. They carry in their hands the symbol of that victory. "They stand before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and PALMS in their hands." Rev. 7: 9. "They came out of the great tribulation." We follow them to their third position. Rev. 20: 4. "They reigned with Christ." We behold them in three stages under their appropriate symbols. First, under the altar, in DEATH with *white robes*. In the second position they are in their resurrection state. The symbol of this state is "*palms*." We see them in the third stage with "*crowns;*" they "reigned with Christ." Such is the meaning we apprehend of the text under consideration.

"HELL"—"HELL FIRE."

A proper understanding of the above terms will help us in the settlement of the question as to what is the end of the wicked. It is known to all that there are *two* Greek words which our translators have rendered hell, in our Bible. One is "*hades*," and is never used to denote the punishment of sinners: the other is "Gehenna," and is the term employed in speaking of the end of the wicked. This last term was perfectly understood among the Jews; and would be to us were it not for the obscurity that it has among persons who do not know to what reference is made where that term is employed. Divines studiously keep the true reference of the term "*hell fire*"—"*gehenna*"—out of sight. Says THE POLYMICRIAN GREEK LEXICON *to the* NEW TESTAMENT, "*Gehenna*, properly the valley of Hinnom, south of Jerusalem: *once celebrated for the horrid worship of Moloch, and afterwards polluted with every species of filth, as well as the carcases of animals, and dead bodies of malefactors; to consume which, in order to avert the pestilence which such a mass of corruption would occasion, constant fires were kept burning.*"

Now, with such scenes and *facts* before our eyes, there could none, who heard our Lord speak of the end of the wicked, mistake his meaning. The impenitent and incorrigible sinner, like the filth about Jerusalem, and the dead bodies of animals and men, if not utterly consumed, would keep alive the plague in the universe; hence, they shall be "cast into *Gehenna*"—*hell fire*. Therefore, "*fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna*—hell."—Mat. 10: 28. Just as certain as the filth about Jerusalem, and dead carcases were cast into the burning fire of the valley of Hinnom, and utterly consumed, just so certain will God destroy both soul and body—i. e., *the entire being* of the incorrigible sinner. That is the plain common sense meaning of our Lord's language; and he was in no danger of being misunderstood by those who heard him. And it remained for the corruptions of Papacy to bring up *eternal torments* in a state of consciousness; and it came into being, along with the doctrine of "*immortal* soul;" which last-mentioned doctrine has given birth to all the fooleries, superstitions, and blasphemies of the church of Rome. Luther, when he first came out against that corrupt church, as may be seen in his defence published in 1530, says—"I permit the Pope to make articles of faith for himself and his faithful; such as that he is Emperor of the world—King of heaven, and God upon earth—that the *soul is immortal*, with all those *monstrous opinions* to be found in the Roman *dunghill* of decretals."

Thus, in the first onset against "*the mother of harlots*," he laid "the axe at the *root of the tree;*" and had he not given way to the opposition of *brother* Reformers, papacy would have been "consumed" long ago. For, take away the doctrine that the soul out of Christ is immortal: and, let the truth come to light, that "the dead know not anything," and you "*eat the flesh*" of "the mother of harlots" and "*burn her with fire.*" She can't live in such a scorching sun. It strips her of her Virgin Mary—Peter—and all her saints, that she worships; and marks her as rank an idolater as the most stupid Hindoo. This is a self-evident truth. Just convince any man that no soul is immortal out of Christ,—that the dead are unconscious—and that our entire future existence depends on the resurrection of the dead, and he *never can be a papist*: the very fountain of papacy is dried up, and it is numbered among the things that "*was and is not.*"

Why should Protestants, then, cling to doctrines the only use of which is to feed Papacy—convert men into infidels, and make universalists? or to send after the strong delusion of "spirit rapping"? "*The soul that sinneth it shall* DIE." But, "to them, who by patient continuance in well-doing, SEEK FOR honor, and glory, and immortality, ETERNAL LIFE." "The dead know not anything;" but the dead in Christ shall rise again; this is certain, because God has promised it, and the demonstration of it is in the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ; but "if the dead rise not"—"then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." The Christian's hope, then, is in the resurrection of the dead at the Advent of Christ: and the end of the wicked is, that "he shall perish forever, like his own dung."—Job 20: 7—that he shall "burn up, saith the Lord of Hosts," and be left "neither root" nor "branch;" yea, "UTTERLY PERISH;" 2 Peter 2: 12. And "Babylon," the whole of her, "shall be *utterly* burnt with fire;" and "that great city shall be thrown down, and shall *be found* NO MORE AT ALL."—Rev. 18: 8, 21.

"HERESY."—We give the following just as we found it in the Protestant Churchman, of July 24th; also in the Christian Advocate and Journal, the Methodist Episcopal organ, of this city.

POWER OF IMMORTALITY.

"Were a man designed only like a fly, to buzz about here for a time, sucking in the air, and licking the dew, then soon to vanish back into nothing, or to be transformed into worms, how sorry and despicable a thing were he? AND SUCH, WITHOUT

RELIGION, WE SHOULD BE. But it supplieth us with business of a most worthy nature and lofty importance; it sitteth us upon doing things great and noble as can be; it engageth us to free our minds from all fond conceits, and to cleanse our hearts from all corrupt affections, to curb our brutish appetites, to tame our wild passions, to correct our perverse inclinations, to confirm the dispositions of our souls, and the actions of our lives to the eternal laws of righteousness and goodness. It putteth us upon the imitation of God, and aiming at the resemblance of his perfections; upon obtaining a friendship, and maintaining a correspondence with the high and holy love; upon fitting our minds for conversation and society with the wisest and purest spirits above; upon providing for an immortal state; upon the acquisition of joy and glory everlasting.—*Dr. Isaac Barrow.*

What have we ever said stronger than that, "man without religion"—or without union with Christ, which is the same thing—will "vanish back into nothing." But "DR. BARROW" said this! That makes all the difference in the world! And very likely, it may be urged, he did *not mean* what he said! Very well; he said what *we mean;* and if the above papers, which copied from Dr. Barrow, do not mean what the words import, let them confess themselves deceived. We believe that just such is man "without religion"—or without union with Christ, the "Life Giver;" with this difference—man is guilty for rejecting life and immortality offered to him through Christ: a guilt of which the lower animals are incapable. Immortality as an offered benefit through Jesus Christ is the most powerful motive to a life of holiness and devotion to God that can be conceived of: and of this motive the common notion of inherent immortality entirely deprives man; and therefore that notion is *subversive* of the power of the Gospel, depriving it of its most mighty engine for turning men from sin to God.

———o———

DOUBTFUL TEXT.—To build a doctrine upon a doubtful text—a text, too, that has no corresponding one to support it—is not the part of wisdom. We have made this remark in reference to the expression, Rev. 20. 5—"But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished."

We were shaken as to the genuineness of this text several years ago, in reading "*The Finished Mystery,*" by George Duke of Manchester. Granville Penn, in his edition of the "New Covenant," notices that it is "unknown in the best Vatican and Moscow manuscripts," and that "it is excluded from the text by Matthæi, in his second edition, though he had given it within brackets in his first edition." Some of the most learned have pronounced Matthæi's version the best critical edition of the New Testament. This fact made us cautious of any appeal to that text for the last two or three years.

When the Syriac version was given us in English, by Prof. Murdock, our attention was first turned to an examination of that text; but lo! it was not there. The Syriac version, Prof. Murdock says, is the oldest version of the New Testament *in any language.* It was copied, of course, from some of the first Greek MSS., which are no longer in existence. This fact settled us that the text is undoubtedly *spurious;* and no one should attempt to build a doctrine upon it. It gives no support to any theory, to rely on such a text. There is not a text of like character in the Bible; and we hope none will appeal to it in any controversy; because, it weakens rather than strengthens their argument.

———o———

For the Examiner.

GOD IS LOVE.

Our God unfolds his mighty love,
Throughout his wide domains;
No less than in the courts above,
He smiles where'er he reigns.
We see him in the vernal bloom,
And in each little star;
We hear him in the ocean's boom,
And dells that tuneful are.

He opens wide the cloudy doors,
To water vale and mead;
He bids the autumn fling its stores
To satisfy our need.
The sun in glory wakes and fades,
Delighting every eye;
And darkness weaves its solemn shades,
While nations sleeping lie.

He stretches out the endless fields
Of calm, eternal blue;
And lore of love and beauty yields
As falls the evening dew.
With kindly hand he soothes in peace
The troubled weary one;
He bids the streams of sorrow cease
And feels to see them run.

With mourning eyes, he looks on those
Who slight his hallowed will;
And mercy from his presence goes
To woe them by her skill.
In wondrous love he sent his Son
To conquer death and hell;
To rescue those that were undone,
By sin's enchanting spell.

The gates of heaven are open wide
To all the tribes of man;
And saints will there in bliss abide,
When suns with age are wan.
Our God is love and love is God,
So perfect is His name;
From age to age his love is showed
Unchangeably the same.

W. G. M.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VIII. NEW YORK, FEBRUARY, 1853. NO. 2

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 140 Fulton-street, (Up Stairs.)

TERMS.--Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

THE RELIGIOUS FACULTY.

BY DR. F. R. LEES, LEEDS, ENGLAND.

THE highest faculty in man is that which enables him to communicate with the heavenly and immortal; which lifts him above the outer frame-work of creation, and wafts his spirit into the realms of God. This wondrous principle—the gift of every man, however much it may be perverted, or how deeply soever it may be buried within him—we call the faculty of religion. It is the crown of all humanity, and links the finite with the infinite. Intellect and imagination are its hand-servants and helpers, but its mission is higher than that of either. The former may conduct it safely through the strife and battle of all human experience, and the latter may attend its progress to the stars of the deepest heaven, and inspire it with their solemn anthems in the great temple of the universe, but they can advance with it no further. Alone and silent in the vast solitudes beyond the material world, which ache with the pain of their immensity, it must wait for the presence of the Eternal, with whose fulness it shall expand into everlasting life and development. The soul then becomes all-seeing and all-knowing. It enters into the counsels of the Creator, and reads the secrets of his government and laws. It pierces, like a pervading spirit, through all the forms of nature, and detects at a glance their spiritual aim and significance. Far below it, lie the foul and murky realms of Denial and palsied Doubt; and the smoke of that demon empire ascends not to its altitude, but wraps its own world in livid darkness, and leaves the inaccessible heavens clear; the inaccessible heavens! which can be reached only by the wings of reverence and of love.

He who has arrived there, and whose being has thus become unfolded into the infinite, has achieved the destiny of man. Jubilant and free, he floats in the ethers of eternity—eternity! whose awful image once flashed *down* upon him with such overpowering revelations of majesty and terror that his soul shrunk before them like a burnt up scroll, is now beautiful to him as a bride. He has conquered the vast gulf that separated her divine loveliness from his heart, and which made her features loom through it with scaring and terrible sublimity. And now he also is eternal! nature and all her mysteries have passed through his spirit, and left their solutions behind them; so that he stands—as on the morning of creation—before the naked intelligence of the universe, whose shining creatures are but the semblance and shadow of these divine invisibilities.

He now sees that it was for this mighty purpose of making himself immortal, of planting his soul in the bosom of the life-kingdom, and giving it to grow there with love and purity and holiness, that God sent him upon the earth. For the soul of man is not essentially and necessarily immortal. Immortality is the result of development, and righteousness is the only condition of the soul's duration. The unrighteous man grows downwards unto death and annihilation. He, therefore, who would live for ever, must dwell in Truth and God; must lay hold of the laws of life, and mount upwards into heaven by his obedience unto them.

The faculty of religion is the first and the last which unfolds itself in man. The child, fresh from the hands of its Maker, is trustful, gentle, and aspiring, and its spirit expands in the sunshine of beauty, in unutterable and serene joy. Out of its pure and unsullied eyes stream floods of celestial light and glory. They are for ever eloquent with life-full thoughts, such as no words can utter. "Of such," indeed, "is the kingdom of heaven." I think one may see heaven itself, mirrored in the deep liquid unfathomable depths of a little child's eyes. And these are signs of its immortal capability. If it be true to its own soul, and the wisdom of the Saviour, it shall one day return to the second childhood, when the divine faculty becomes matured through trial and sorrow, and the child-like man dwells in peace and bliss with God. Between this first and last revelation of the soul, lies the battle-ground of man; and in proportion to his virtue and valor, in overcoming the temptations which surround him, or his cowardice in yielding to their enticements, shall be his reward of life or his punishment of death. For the last revelation only comes to him who has won it by his works. To him who has won it not, not only the revelation, but the holy organ itself, is extinct.

It would be the most sorrowful trifling to attempt, at any time, a *proof* of the reality of this high power in man, or of the sublime spiritual condition which it evolves. The most eloquent words can never represent a truth to that mind which is unprepared by previous discipline and experience to receive it; and hence, in ignorance of this law, arises the taunt of the scoffer, and the ridicule which sensual men cast upon the religious life. Yet the history of all great and good minds is a sacred scripture of testimony to its reality. It fills the soul with joy and beauty, whilst dwelling in its earthly tabernacle—it binds the brows of death with the flowers of hope—and sings its triumphant anthems through the dim chancels of the grave. The grave itself is but the passage of a cloistered gloom which leads, like a sun-burst, into the presence and paradise of God.

All human culture, if its aim be to achieve the majestic and the God-like, must tend to the per-

fection of man as a religious being. For the soul never arrives at its full stature—its spiritually plastic beauty—until the spirit of religion has been infused throughout its members. An uninspired artist may produce physical loveliness from his block of marble, but a holier hand is requisite to kindle it with the celestial fire, and make it felt as a living influence.

We are perpetually reminded of the want of this culture in our intercourse with the world, and even in our more friendly associations. Never, perhaps, was the intellect more intensely active, nor the accomplishments of learning more generally diffused. The mathematician and the scholar are present in almost every assembly; but the divine man—he whose thoughts and aspirations are directed evermore to the good and beautiful—is seldom seen. It is rare to meet with a serious and solemn man in the mart and fair of society. Instead of him, we have idle and scandalous gossips, who sink us deeper and deeper into the mires of pollution. Looking at life through the common medium of intercourse with our fellow creatures, it is so pretty and ignoble, that death were infinitely preferable. We continually need men to speak to us words of life, and hope, and love. We are all too apt to descend—to forget our high vocation; to gather weeds, when we should be plucking flowers.

And yet no one comes to perform the office of the god-like for us—none to inspire us with grand thoughts, and fill us with the enthusiasm of spiritual chivalry. Clearly, therefore, we must be our own oracles—and become that ourselves, of which we lament the want, in others.

For men have now lost their faith both in God and themselves; and this dread calamity is the heaviest which can fall upon the human race. It is the source of every evil and corruption, and pollutes the world with perpetual decay and death. We seem, indeed, to be fast descending from all nobility and glory of manhood, into the apish forms of satyrs, and the impure monsters of the fabulous ages. Having neglected our *one* talent, even that is taken away from us, and we are abandoned to the negations. Our love of Gold has crushed our love of God, until we are become worse than the wildest theoretical Atheist, in our practical denial of the existence of God, and our contempt for his most righteous laws. It is this sad reduction of the spirit of man—this utter faithlessness in the holy object of his mission upon earth, which prevents all high and beautiful human aspect, and gives us haggard portraitures of Midas for the glorious impersonations of Apollo and of Jove.

Who can look, for instance, into the face of John Milton, such as we know it, without feeling that he stands in the presence of a man whose spirit was as pure and holy as it was musical and severe? And who can gaze upon the features of any true man of genius, or of pious life, without blushing in agonies of sorrow, for the sensual and bloated appearance of the mass of mankind?

There can be no doubt that the inward being moulds the proportions of the physical; and the character of a man, in plainer words, writes itself ineffaceably upon his outer image, and stamps it either with loveliness or deformity. Think not, O unhappy Voluptuary! O Miser, Drunkard, or Brutal-hearted! to hide your baseness and wickedness from us, however secretly or silently ye may do your deeds; for, in spite of you, the infernal, like a ghastly phantom, grins over your heads, and proclaims whose children ye are! But, in mercy to yourselves and the race, cast the devils out of you, and purge yourselves for the indwelling of the angels!

And here let us announce the law of the highest, as it relates to human development, and say: that in the exact ratio of a man's spiritual or religious attainment, is he *felt* to be a living presence and a power. Before the full soul, every lower soul must bow, and though he were silent as the Theban statuary, there is such an enchantment of heaven's own magic in his person, that he is accredited of all men for the lordly majesty of his gifts and influence.

To arrive, therefore, at such celestial heights and beatitudes should be the object of every one. It is clearly in the power of all to gain these glorious summits, where the true infinitude of man's life becomes sensibly revealed to him.

There is, however, no "royal road" to these last altitudes. They can be reached only through the furnace of trial, and the grandeur glooms of a speechless unutterable sorrow; a sorrow which conquers life by its solemnity, and the mightiness of its enduring love. The religious faculty, in short, can have no real unfolding until the human soul has become purified through the blood of the passions. It must, first of all, set itself in battle array against the allurements of the world, and the seduction of the senses; and in this heroic attitude, with the stern resolves of valor and virtue within it, it shall gradually arrive at new insights and holier conditions. Every triumph which it obtains over temptation adds fresh accession to its existence. Every defeat it endures strikes whole cycles from its eternity; for death and hell are the consummations of vice, and life everlasting is the crown of virtue—inasmuch as virtue is allied to that higher existence of which reverence, and faith, and love, are the spiritual conditions. We call this existence *religious*, and remark: That it is the legitimate and inevitable result of a true human culture.

No one who understands what we here mean by the word "true," will charge us with building too entirely upon individual effort for the attainment of the religious state. He will know that all unaided effort is barren and unprofitable, and that *no man can arrive at insights into God's will and laws, who does not repose with confidence and humility upon God himself.* The gospel of self-reliance which we so unceasingly proclaim, is but one side of our truth; and would be worthless if it were not based upon the love and reliance of God. No man, indeed, can think much without coming, like Sir Isaac Newton, to the conclusion of his sand-like nothingness. He only is strong who, rejecting a priestly arm of flesh, leans upon the bosom of the Almighty; he only is wise who nobly dares to do *His* work, and to leave the rest. Since, however, the religious existence is the natural result of a true human unfolding, and the highest form of all existence, it is, therefore, the supreme life-mission of every man to struggle after and attain it. For what is our business upon this earth? To eat and drink, and die? Ah, no! For there is that within

us which, at times at least, gives the lie to all sensual pleasures, and compels us to listen to more elevating thoughts and inspirations. This is that light which enlightens every man coming into the world. It says to us: "You, O man! born out of eternity into time; an apparition of life—who wert not, and now art; with infinite capacities! which can grasp the stars and suns of the vast universe—and prison them in thy own soul—making thee also an universe! out of whom goeth forth the deep unfathomable idea of God! master of all things—sovereign lord of all things—bethink thee—what a mute unspeakable privilege is this, thy life! Bethink thee, that thou also, art brother of the august band of worthies who have planted this magic dream-land of existence with undying thoughts—with hopes that reach *beyond* life, and stretch into the life of lives, where the dreams of this become the realities of that. Thou, the brother of Christ, who first saw the kingdom of heaven, and died that thou mightest attain unto it. Bethink thee, what meanings lie in the mysterious creation, for thy spirit to gather to itself. If thou art sad and desponding, and seest no aim in thy existence, think how wonderful it is to *be*. Think also of those who have gone before thee, back again into the night of darkness, who bore themselves bravely upwards through the same difficulties which beset thee, and have left their words and deeds for thy consolation. Look thou, also, upwards!—forego the slavery of sense, and press continually forwards until thou stand before the face of God, immortal by thy Christian conquests."

The only business, indeed, which man can have upon this earth, is to unfold *his entire nature*. Yet it would appear necessary, at the very outset, to convince men, in this day, that they really *have* a nature to unfold; for if we look around us in the busy commercial world, we shall see no evidences that any such truth is credited to the human family in the ledger of God. Few men understand what their entire nature is, and have scarcely felt any higher faculties within them than those which illustrate the relations of pounds, shillings, and pence to the staple commodities of trade. We do not mean to *under*-value these faculties; but admit their worth to the full extent of their claims. But, absolutely, there *is* a God! and there are other and higher relations which we bear to him than any trading accounts can satisfy. And it is to this fact that our thoughts should be incessantly directed. Why should not trade and commerce—the great evangelists of civilization—be conducted by holy men upon holy principles? and thus become a means of human development, instead of a barrier to its progress. As much religion may be present in the sale of rags or ribbons, as the most ecstatic prayer and praise: all that is necessary is, that a true religious man should be at the bottom of the transaction. No craft and no employment are mean, when they are practised for culture. The soul can as easily and truly grow, under the soot-bag of the sweep, as under the gown of the divinity doctor. But wo! to that man who enslaves his soul to his trade, and sets up his gold in the stead of God for worship. It need not be so. The acquisition of wealth is honorable, when it is lawfully followed, and made subservient to the acquisition of *being*. But when once the love of wealth has quenched the divine perception of a people, when they can no longer bear the words of genius, and make a scoff at the revelations of the poet and the prophet, it is a fatal sign—a sign of ignominious life-in-death! Our object, therefore, is to draw men out of this awful state, by proclaiming the existence of that high faculty which we have called religious; by shewing that the way to get it unfolded within them, is to be truthful to themselves, to their fellow creatures, and to God. They must first of all have an infinite trust in the revealed destiny of the soul: They must believe that all good and holy thoughts and deeds are progressive expansions of their life to the accomplishment of that destiny: That all obscenities, whether in idea or action, are a sort of satanic devices to kill the soul, and rob it of its god-like attributes; and with these emblazonries over their life-temple, they are to go forth, day by day, until they realize the perfection and the consummation of their existence in the life-worship of their Maker.

—o—

THE NEW YEAR'S EVE
OF AN ERRING ONE.

A FREE VERSION FROM "JEAN PAUL." BY F. R. LEES.

It is the New Year's Midnight. An Old Man, with despondent and despairing look, appears standing at a window. He gazes upward upon the still, star-flowered heavens; downward upon the pure, quiet, snow-white earth—earth where not any are now so joyless and so sleepless as he.

His grave was close by, hidden only by the snow of age, not by the verdure of youth; and, alas! out of a long life, he has brought no fair and fragrant flowers to adorn it—nothing save sins, and sickness, and an emaciated frame—a barren soul—a bosom full of poison, and an age full of ruth.

And now his Young Days, like Spirits, move before him, leading him again to the bright clear morn, when his Father had placed him at the Parting of the Ways of Life—that to the right conducting, up the sun-lit Steep of Virtue, into a far-off but peaceful land of light and harvest, full of angels—that to the left, downwards through the mole-track of Vice, into a black Hell, full of dripping poisons, full of darting serpents, and dark sweltering vapors!

Ah! those serpents twine about his breast, those poison drops hang upon his tongue: he knows not where he is!

In an anguish inexpressible, he lifts up his voice to heaven: he cries: "Give me back my youth once more! Oh, Father! place me once again at the Parting of the Ways, that I may choose the right!"

Alas! his youth and his father have long disappeared in the far Past.

He beholds only misleading lights dancing by the water-courses, and disappearing on a funeral-ground—and he sighs, "They are my Foolish Days!"

He sees a star shoot out of the heavens, shimmer in its fall, and disperse on the earth. "Such am I!"—exclaims his bleeding heart, while the serpant fang of Remorse fastens deeper into his wounds.

Fearful is the Pantasmagoria which his inflamed

fancy now brings before him: Night-walkers gliding upon the roofs—windmills, with vast uplifted arms, threatening to strike—and a skull, left in an empty dead-house, momently assuming the lineaments of life.

Suddenly and soothingly, in the midst of this nightmare of the soul, the New Year's Music floats downward from a tower, like the far-off melody of psalms. The old man grows less agitated. He surveys the wide horizon,—he scans the white earth, and as he gazes upon the scene, recalls the friends of his youth—friends who now, happier and worthier than he, are teachers of the land—fathers of children and blessed men.

"O!" he cries, "I too, like you, could have slept this first night of the new-born year, tearless and terrorless—had I but *willed* it! I also might have been happy, ye dear parents, had I fulfilled your New Year's wishes, your wise instructions!"

In such feverish reminiscences of his youthful time, it seemed to him as if the skull in the dead-house rose up: then—for on New Year's Eve, it is said, men behold spirits and the future—it shapes itself into a living youth, in the attitude of the Boy of the Capitol drawing out a thorn—and his own form, as it appeared in the bloom and beauty of youth, is conjured up in mockery before him!

There stands the vision—his Past confronting his Present self! He can endure the agony no longer—he covers his eyes—a flood of hot but blessed tears flow fast from their fountains, sinking in the snow as they fall; he only sighs—sadly and sense-benumbed—"Come back again, my youth—come back!"

And it *did* come back; for this miserable one had only so frightfully *dreamt* on this New Year's Midnight. He was yet a youth—but his follies and frailties had been no dream! Heartily then, did he thank God, that he *could* still, while young, turn back out of the filthy track of Vice, and betake himself to the sun-lit paths which lead to the pure land of harvests.

Turn with him, young reader, if thou standest upon his erring path! Remember! this fearful dream will in future become thy Judge, if *thou* shouldest *ever* cry out in thine anguish—"Return, days of my childhood, return!" THEY WILL NOT RETURN.

GOD NOT A GOD OF THE DEAD, BUT OF THE LIVING.

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM, ENGLAND.

"Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto him."—Luke 20, 37, 38.

It is commonly supposed that this text teaches that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob *are now living as disembodied souls*, but a careful and candid examination will convince that it teaches nothing of the kind. The Sadducees believed that when mankind died, they passed as completely out of personal existence, as before they had any personal existence at all,—an opinion which neither our Lord nor his apostles ever rebuked. But they further maintain that the dead would never more be restored to conscious life by means of resurrection, which, they presumed, was an impossibility. It never seems to have been suggested to them that the Divine energy is as miraculously displayed in creating the personal existence of men, who before their birth, had no existence, as in reviving their existence by resurrection, after it has been extinguished by death. Now it was in reference to *this part* of the Sadducees' creed, that the text above exclusively refers. Let it be specially noted, that these words of Christ contain his memorable refutation of the Sadducean error that there will be *no resurrection of the dead.* It was of persons of this belief, that Paul in one of his public apologies, inquired, "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?"

The sense generally imputed to this text, is as follows:—Because God is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and, because God is not the God of the dead, but of the living, therefore Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are *now* living.

Now it is not for any one to say what these words *can be made to mean*, but to humbly inquire *what they really do mean.* If the common opinion of this text, which has just been stated, is the meaning which our Lord intended to convey, then, WHERE IS THE PROOF TO THE SADDUCEES THAT THE DEAD WILL RISE AGAIN? for it was with the special object of proving the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, that Christ uttered these words.

The point to be proved, is by our Lord, thus formally announced: "*Now that the dead are raised,*" or as it is in Mark, "*And as touching the dead that they rise*, have ye not read in the book of Moses," &c. The popular interpretation *destroys the proof* that the dead will rise, which is the point in question, and forces the words to teach a doctrine which is contrary to all Scripture, viz: that when men are dead and buried, they are living without bodies, and before the resurrection. This popular exposition *cannot* be the right one, since it could not have convinced the Sadducees that the dead will live again by resurrection. But expounded in accordance with our Lord's avowed purpose, which was, to prove by the writings of Moses, the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, we see in his text, a most convincing proof of that all-important doctrine. Addressing his sceptical interrogators, our Lord thus virtually spoke,—"You have read in the writings of Moses, in whom you believe, that God is called the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, *long after they were among the buried dead.* Now if Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were dead in that absolute sense, which you Sadducees maintain, that they will never live again, then how could Moses address God as *their* God? for he is not a God of the dead but of the living. But you perceive that God is called the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, although they were *then dead*, and had been from any years. Then it is certain that, if God is not the God of the dead but of the living, these holy patriarchs are not dead forever; God must, evidently, intend to raise them up again at the resurrection of the just. There is a very intelligible sense in which it may be said that 'all' who have lived, and are yet to live, 'live' as if present, "unto Him." Although these patriarchs are not living now in their actual personality before God, yet they live in God's me-

mory, affections and purposes. This relatively brief extinction of their existence does not cut them off from God, 'who *quickeneth the dead, and calleth things which be not, as though they were.*'—Rom. 4: 17. Therefore, because Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob *will live again at the resurrection*, when I 'the resurrection and the life' shall come to bring salvation to the dead,—God, the 'God of the living,' is appropriately called their God."

This exposition exhibits what our Lord undertook to prove, viz., THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD. The argument is simple and convincing. The point in dispute, "Now that the dead are raised," is triumphantly established. "Then certain of the scribes answering, said, 'Master, thou hast well said.'"

If the above be a correct interpretation of the text under consideration, and it should be borne in mind that it does what the popular interpretation does *not* do, that is, it exhibits *a consummate proof of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead*, which was the special doctrine our Lord undertook to establish in opposition to the error of the Sadducees,—if this interpretation, we say, be correct, then is it a *new independent argument*.

We are aware that our interpretation of this much-misunderstood text will meet with much opposition, because it represents the condition of the dead, previous to the resurrection, as one of insensibility and unconsciousness. This presentation of an important article of divine revelation has not merely to appeal to the calm and independent decision of the judgment, but also to contend against the hereditary traditions of a human theology, and stem the impatient tide of adverse human sympathies. The exhibition of divine truth concerning the state of man in death, is confessedly one from which our life-loving nature recoils. It is THE CURSE which an accommodating theology has sought to transform into a confection. Curse it is, and curse it may remain, until mortality shall be swallowed up of life! "The wages of sin is *death*." As is the work, so are the wages; both alike are bitter! But shall we on this account, hide our eyes from what most surely awaits all who shall "sleep in the dust of death," and seek imaginary peace in an antiquated delusion! The recognition of this gloomy fact ought to enhance the preciousness of Christ, as "the Resurrection and the Life," and kindle a grateful enthusiasm in the assurance that "the last enemy which shall be destroyed, is DEATH." Let us rather rejoice in the gospel of Everlasting Life, and find sure solace in the fact that "the Lord is risen indeed, and become the *first-fruits* of them that slept;" and that he has said—"Because I live, ye shall (hereafter) live also." "There is a natural body," says Paul, "and there is a spiritual body;" and if the former, which we now own, must become a wreck, the latter shall, at the time of resurrection, prove a living temple enduring unto eternal life. The Bible tells us nothing about *bodiless* existence; on the contrary, it assures us that IF THE DEAD RISE NOT, *then they which have fallen* ASLEEP IN CHRIST *are* PERISHED.—1 Cor. 15. Until the resurrection, all the deceased are in the state of those concerning whom it is said, "*The dead* PRAISE NOT the Lord, neither any that go down into SILENCE."—Psa. 115, 17. "*Man lieth down and riseth not till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep.*"—Job 14: 12. Hence the Scriptures give so much prominence to Christ as "the Resurrection and the Life," and represent his second coming as the season of joyous redemption to his Church. "Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so. Come Lord Jesus!" Rev. 22: 20.

IMMATERIALITY.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD INCOMPATIBLE WITH IMMATERIALITY.

BY THOMAS READ. New York.

There is no proof that the soul and spirit of man differ in their nature from the souls and spirits of the cattle of the field; the difference in man consists in the superiority and number of the *organs of the body*. The spirits and souls of cattle would develope high reasoning and moral powers, if they had suitable organs for such development. *All the faculties belong to the bodily organization*, and none to the soul or to the spirit; but these faculties can only be excited to action through the soul and spirit. Happiness results from the activity and harmonious gratification of all the faculties. Of the three *essential* elements of his being, man's bodily organization is entitled to the pre-eminence. Hence the transcendant importance of the resurrection of the dead, a doctrine completely obscured by the prevailing notion of immateriality. If the soul were immaterial and immortal, and could possibly be conscious, independently of the body, there could be no such thing as a resurrection of the *dead*; it would be an absurdity. And so we find that the advocates of immateriality deny the resurrection of the *dead*, and affirm that there will be "a resurrection of the *body*" *only*, to which the soul or spirit, or both, (for error is seldom explicit,) will be "*reunited!*"

Paul preached "that the *dead are raised*," and taught the nature of the change. "It is sown an [*animal*] body—it is raised a *spiritual* body. Howbeit, that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is [animal] and afterwards," (at the resurrection,) "that which is spiritual." The risen Jesus is a pattern of the substantial and tangible nature of the spiritual body, who will reign with his saints upon the earth. So, "if the dead rise not," they cannot inherit the land of promise, and "they which have fallen asleep in Christ have perished." "For David has not ascended into the heavens." Can an immortal soul perish? "If the dead rise not, let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die;" for we have no future life. Can words more plainly condemn the notion of an independent, self-conscious soul, than does Paul? The unconsciousness of the dead is plainly taught in many other passages in the Bible. "By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out *into a place*, which he should *afterward* receive for his inheritance, obeyed." "By faith he sojourned in the land of promise as in a strange country, dwelling," (not in lasting habitations) "but in tents with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise." "These all died in faith, not having received the promises." For God had said, "I will give unto *thee*, and to

thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, *all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession ;* and I will be their God." And that the dead are raised, Moses taught at the bush, calling God, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God; (though they are dead,) for he hath prepared for them a city, (the New Jerusalem,) therefore the dead must rise, for God is not the God of the dead, (who will never be raised,) but of the living; of those whom God will raise to inherit the kingdom. "I will ransom them from the *power of the grave.*"

Christians, to be consistent, should at once repudiate the Popish notion of the self-consciousness, and natural immortality of the soul; or openly discard the Bible as the *only* rule of faith, and return to the other vain traditions of the fathers, to Latin masses, and to wafer gods. Most truly does Bishop Hughes expatiate on the decline of Protestantism, and on the increasing tendency of the sectarian churches towards Romanism. The churches, with their conflicting creeds, which are made by too many the "only rule of faith," establish the Popish principal that "the church must interpret the Bible;" and thus, in the name of religion and *Protestantism*, they are undermining the very bulwark of Christianity—THE WORD OF THE LIVING GOD. We most fervently implore all professing Christians to be decided for the cause of truth, of the Bible, and of God; and after due investigation, to openly acknowledge their convictions, that man is mortal, and that *without a resurrection, there is no future life.*

NON-RESURRECTION.

There has been considerable said and written on the non-resurrection of the wicked, which, to my mind, is uncalled for; and is productive of no practical good. I think its tendency is evil; and only evil. It has been charged home upon those whom I consider to be true Bibleites; "that Storrism is baptised infidelity; that they make the sayings of infidel France true, &c.; so that death is an eternal sleep." Now I wish to say just a word or two on this subject. What has been written and published in the Examiner, and Harbinger, on the non-resurrection of the wicked, I do not consider to be the doctrine of Bro. Storrs, neither do I believe it to be the true Bible doctrine; for to my mind, it sets one part of the Scriptures against the other; thereby making the Bible say *yes*, and *no*, on the same important subject. I object to it then, because it destroys the idea of a general Judgment—which is so clearly expressed in the Scriptures. "For we must all appear before the Judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body; according to that he hath done; whether it be good or bad."—2 Cor. 5 : 10. How, I ask, can those to whom the Apostle then spake, come before the Judgment Seat of Christ without a resurrection? For the good and bad are to be there. If only the good, why did not the Apostle say so? If friend Macknight, and others are correct in their conclusions, then, in fact, there will be no judgment seat at all; for, if the wicked die out of the world, and that is the end of them, of course they will not appear.

If all that are raised are good, and only good, they will not need to appear. Hence, there is no necessity for a Judgment Seat. What saith Scripture on this subject? "I said in mine heart, God shall judge the righteous and the wicked; for there is a time there for every purpose and for every work."—Eccl. 3 : 17. "Rejoice, O young man; but know thou that God will bring every work into judgment; whether it be good or whether it be evil."—12 : 14. "Because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world (the whole world; not merely one-fourth part of it,) in righteousness," &c.—Acts 17 : 31. Again, "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works."—Matt. 17 : 27. It is said, at that day when Jesus shall come, that before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats."—Matt. 25 : 32. This brings our minds down to the end of the world; the second coming of Christ; and the general Judgment. Can any one suppose that from the above account, none but the righteous will be raised, and come to judgment, and that the righteous will then and there be divided? the one part be sheep, and the other goats? There will be no goats unless the wicked are raised. Else the judgment was designed only for the generation that should live on the earth at the Saviour's Second Advent. I apprehend none will take that ground. God is to "judge the secrets of men, according to my gospel;" saith Paul.—Rom. 2 : 16. The plan of the judgment is revealed in the gospel.

"And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God, and the books were opened; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and (the grave) hell, delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged, every man according to their works, and whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire."—Rev. 20 : 12, 13–15.

The above is so plain that it needs no comment. The small and great—the sea giving up her dead—death and the grave giving up their dead—and those whose names not being written in the book of life, cast into the lake of fire, which is the second death, is proof enough, to my mind, of the resurrection of all; righteous and unrighteous, the just and the unjust; and of a general judgment. Again, I object to the non-resurrection of the wicked, because the teaching of Christ and the apostles, in regard to men's being brought into judgment, could have no bearing upon, or reference to them, to whom they gave instructions; for whenever and wherever they preached, they published a judgment to come, for saints and sinners. Hence, if the wicked rise not, then I say, the Saviour's instructions, on that point, could have no reference to the wicked of his time. The same may be said of the apostles. Again, if the wicked rise not, of all past ages, how shall every eye see him? and they also which pierced him, when He cometh with clouds? I must now dismiss this subject for want of room; hoping some one may be benefitted by these reflections. My only desire is, to know the truth, and to defend it at all hazards; for it is through the truth that I expect to be sanctified, and made meet for the coming and kingdom of God. C. W. L.

"THE PENALTY OF THE LAW."

BRO. STORRS:—I notice the remarks of "Inquirer," in your last interesting Examiner, on my belief, that eternal death is the just and revealed penalty of the law.

He writes, "I should like to know how there can be any deliverance to man at all if the penalty is eternal death?" I reply, on the same principle that there may be deliverance to the murderer, by the pardon of the executive. If the faith, that God, "the Father of mercies," can answer our prayer, "forgive us our trespasses," for his name's sake, and "for Christ's sake," is a "Babylonish garment," I have no desire to be "divested of" it. I desire to enter the everlasting kingdom in it, "shouting, 'Grace, grace unto it.'"

Inquirer remarks that, "the wages of sin *is death;*" —and "the wages of *the sin* of rejecting the gospel scheme of deliverance from death is '*everlasting destruction*,' or 'eternal death.'" I find no warrant in the Scriptures for this distinction. On the contrary, the very passage referred to, assigns the same punishment of everlasting destruction, or eternal death, to those "who know not God," (i. e., to the heathen, who do not improve the light they have) as to those who "obey not the Gospel"; though the sufferings, antecedent to the second and eternal death, will be "sorer" in the latter case than in the former.

The term eternal, or everlasting death, never occurs in the Scriptures. Yet it is obvious that the term must be so understood in the several passages. It must be so understood in at least two passages quoted by "Inquirer." "There is a sin unto death." "There is a sin not unto death." The contrast requires the same construction, for the term death in both passages. That the first imports eternal death will not be denied. Such must be the import of the second, for it is not true that there is any sin which is "not unto death" temporal, i. e., which does not deserve it.

If the wages of sin is not *eternal* death—if this is not the desert of sin, then those heathen, who have committed things "worthy of death," (Rom. 1: 32,) deserve death only for a period, and, consequently, have a claim to future life. "He that converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death." James 5: 20. This must mean eternal death, for such conversion does not save from the first death. "Why will ye die?" must be of the same import, for turning from transgression does not save from the first death. Ezek. 18: 31. "Sin when it is finished bringeth forth death." James 1: 15. So the words destroy and destruction, must be understood in the eternal sense in passages where the adjective is not appended. See 1 Cor. 3: 17, Math. 10: 28, Phil 3: 19, Ps. 73: 18. Inquirer remarks: "The sin, the penalty of which is eternal death, I do think, hath never forgiveness." He also affirms that "the wages of *the sin* of rejecting the gospel—is eternal death." If so, it follows, that speaking against the Son of Man hath no more forgiveness than speaking against the Holy Ghost. Many rejectors of the gospel have subsequently believed it and been forgiven.

It is also observed that "God's words cannot be set aside." It is important to observe that both the divine threatenings and promises, are to be understood in harmony with the principles of the divine government. The word of the Lord, by Jonah, to Nineveh was, "Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown." But "when they turned from their evil way;—God repented of the evil that he had said that he would do unto them and he did it not." God hath said, "The soul that sinneth it shall die," i. e., forever. "The wages (desert) of sin is (eternal) death." Yet when men repent, God repents of the evil that he has threatened and does it not. According to Inquirer's views, God's word has been set aside, if we understand the words, "The wages of sin is death," to import only a *temporary* death. Enoch and Elijah were sinners, for "all have sinned," yet they never died at all. Elijah's sin of impatience is recorded 1 Kings 19: 4.

The truth is, that rebellion against the holy government of God, both of law and gospel, justly exposes an intelligent being to the forfeiture of life, without any claim for its restoration.

VERITAS.

FROM N. PLUMB.

BURNT, CORN., ALA., Dec. 20, 1852.

I rejoice to hear that you "yet live" to proclaim the Bible doctrine of "No Immortality, nor Endless Life, except through Jesus Christ alone."

This doctrine I have believed and proclaimed for some time—and "day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth the knowledge," that it is true. In other words, all my experience convinces me that man is mortal—born to die—without any life in himself, or any prospect of Immortality except in and through belief in Christ, and the resurrection of the dead.

My belief always has been, that all who are dead and buried were in an unconscious state—know not anything, neither can know until raised up and clothed upon with that spiritual body which is the gift of God, and Eternal Life. An intermediate state savors of the Roman Catholic Purgatory: and could I believe that man never dies—never ceases to exist—I should be ready to adopt modern spiritualism, *alias* Universalism, or any *ism* that would vindicate God from this charge of injustice in holding myriads of human beings forever in a life of horrid misery, among the weepings, wailings and gnashing of teeth, where hope and mercy are unknown.

I venture the assertion, that in less than ten years the present popular opinion—that the wicked are to dwell in Endless Torment—will be numbered among the things that were—and repudiated by all sensible men.

It is now more a matter of question than belief among the sectarians; and the great battle now to be fought is between *spiritualism* and *Materialism;* or, whether all the wicked are to be saved or destroyed. The great question will soon be,—which and what is Truth—Universalism or Destructionism? God speed the right, and lead us all into the truth as it is in Christ Jesus.

"THE [BRITISH] CHRISTIAN EXAMINER and *Bible Advocate*," was received just as we were going to press; too late to notice this month.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY, 1853.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—Our friends have our thanks for the prompt manner in which they have responded to our request for early remittances. If any have not received the promised *premium*, of Ham's works, who think they are entitled to it, let us know, and they shall be sent. We intended to send those works to all whose letters are dated prior to Dec. 25th, with the remittance for this year. It is possible some may have been overlooked; if so we shall be happy to send them.

———o———

WE OFFER the following *Premiums* for those who send money for the present volume of the Examiner, whether for old subscribers or new ones; and it shall apply to any person who has sent money since Dec. 25th, who was not in time for the premium offered to those who paid prior to that, provided they so inform us.

1. For *two* dollars, for two copies of the Bible Examiner for 1853, one set of the double Examiners, containing Ham's works, sent to any one they choose.

2. For $3, for *three* copies of the Examiner for 1853, one set of the Examiner for 1852, entire. Or if preferred, the entire volumes for '50 and '51 in sheets.

3. For $5, for *five* subscribers for '53, we will give one set of the Examiner for each of the years '49, '50, '51, and '52, in sheets.

In all cases the postage on the papers sent as a premium must be paid by the person ordering them. The postage, however, is only half a cent on each number if *prepaid;* which can be done by sending us Post-office stamps. Two "three cent" stamps for each volume, is all that is required.

These premiums will be continued till the offers are revoked. Any who intend to avail themselves of them must say so *distinctly*, and *which* offer they accept. This is necessary to avoid confusion and disappointment.

———o———

CORRECTIONS.—In the last Examiner the name of MILES GRANT was omitted, and the omission overlooked till too late. The article headed "*Good News*," from Winsted, Conn., was from Bro. Grant.

On page 13, left hand column, twelfth line from bottom, for "*poising*" read *poisoning*. On page 16, last column, thirteenth line from bottom, for "*woe*" read *woo*.

———o———

BR. DOBNEY, we are glad to learn, did not go to Australia, as we announced in our last, but remains in England; having given up the project. We hope he will soon favor us with communications for the Examiner. We should be truly glad, also, to hear from Bro. White, Hereford, Eng., again, and any others on that side of the Atlantic, whether now known to us or not, who are interested in the general object of the Examiner.

———o———

VISIT TO BUFFALO, N. Y.—Since our last issue of the Examiner, we have spent two Sabbaths and the week intervening with Bro. Blain, in the city of Buffalo. We have seldom spent eight days more satisfactorily; and, we believe, profitably. Bro. Blain, and a few others, had prepared the way by publishing the notice in six daily papers, and posting up hand-bills, stating enough of the doctrine to be preached to awaken attention, so that there was a good assembly to begin with, and the interest increased up to the last. For the second Sabbath we had to procure a larger hall; and though that day was extremely cold—the coldest of this winter—there was a larger congregation during the day than at any previous time; and in the evening very much larger yet. All the meetings were marked by the attendance of an intelligent class of people—many of whom had never before heard of the great subject of "Immortality only through Christ." The attention was all that could be desired in the assemblies; and though we sometimes taxed their patience by long discourses they seemed not at all restless.

The consolation we felt, in our own mind, while giving those *twelve* Lectures is known only to Him who *comforteth* all who put their trust in him. Never did we feel more the value of the truths we proclaimed—"Life only through Christ; and that by a Resurrection from the Dead." Little do those understand of the *value* of Christ and the resurrection who do not understand this subject.

There were several interesting occurrences during our visit at Buffalo, which we leave Bro. Blain to communicate if he thinks best. One evidence of interest is, that we received over twenty subscribers for the Examiner at that meeting.

We preached to large and interesting audiences at Canandaigua and Rochester, on our way to Buffalo; and at Auburn on our way back, on the "*French Empire*."

We were absent two weeks, traveled a thousand miles, and preached fifteen times, from one hour to one and three-quarters each time. The Lord wonderfully sustained our strength and preserved our health; to His name be all the praise and glory, through Jesus Christ our *Life-Giver*.

One word about getting up meetings. It is of little use for our friends to invite us to visit them unless they are willing to go to some expense in

giving notice of the meeting, and see that it is given out thoroughly; and also a central and comfortable place secured for the meeting. If this is not attended to they may expect to discourage our heart, and they themselves be disappointed as to the good that shall result. Do not ask us to visit you if these things cannot be done.

———o———

"BIBLE VS. TRADITION," ONCE MORE.—Br. Rufus Wendell, Canajoharie, N. Y., writes—

"I am extremely anxious that the work upon which Bros. Read and Ellis have bestowed so much labor should be published, and that at an early day. I deem it my duty to contribute *ten* dollars towards the enterprise, upon the terms named by you in the Examiner. You have certainly offered to assume your share of the risk, and I hope others will not be wanting to bring up the remainder. It is my firm conviction that the work in question cannot fail of being a very useful one. If the dominant theology concerning 'man in death,' and the doom of the finally impenitent, is an error, it is a serious one; and the friends of truth cannot witness its tendencies without concern. 'Orthodoxy' will have enough to do, if it has not already, when the 'BIBLE VS. TRADITION' appears in the field. That it may enter soon is my earnest wish."

We can say little more on the subject than we said in the last number. About $85 have now been pledged to help publish the work; but the $200 is not yet forthcoming. Shall it be made up? Just think—Bros. Ellis and Read have spent time enough in preparing the work to earn twice the money necessary to publish it; and, if published, we must spend weeks in superintending it, added to all our other cares of books, paper, traveling, preaching, answering correspondents, &c. We are afraid that some will "*perish with*" their money who profess to love these truths and yet manifestly love money *more.*

We published at our own expense thousands of copies of our Six Sermons, when we had funds, and scattered them without fee or reward, over the United States. Those were not scattered in vain. But the time has come to push this battle still harder; and we need works more critical, and as a kind of *Manual* to which those who have little time for thorough investigation can turn at once for assistance in carrying forward the great work to which God has called us. Shall such a work be issued? Shall Bros. Read and Ellis go unrewarded for all *their* labor? to say nothing of our own in bringing out such a work. We do really think those brethren ought to receive compensation for their labor. They are poor, and yet have done a work worth more than the riches of earth. Now ye who have the funds act as you think God will approve in the day of our Lord Jesus' coming. We intend to say no more about this matter.

"FUTURE RETRIBUTION."

The following extract from the remarks of PROFESSOR STUART, in the Biblical Repository, July 1840, shows how a powerful mind may be exercised in endeavoring to reconcile the endless misery theory with the perfections of God or the felicity of the saints in glory. He says:—

"That the subject is one of fearful interest, none will deny who believe in future retribution. That there are difficulties pressed by it on the mind, when one thinks of his own condition, that of his beloved friends, or of his brethren of the human race, it would be *mere pretence* to deny. But it is a consolation to believe, that, behind any clouds, however dark, that interpose between us and the light of the sun, his beams still shine clearly. All will be clear in the light of heaven. *If parents, husbands, wives, brothers, sisters, must see those dear as their own life perish at last, while they themselves are saved, heaven in mercy will either* EXTINGUISH THEIR SOCIAL SUSCEPTIBILITIES, *or else give them such* A SWEET AND OVERPOWERING SENSE OF THE JUSTICE AND GOODNESS OF GOD *as shall not permit the joys of the blessed to be marred, nor the songs of the redeemed to be interrupted, with sighs of sympathic sorrow.*"

Thus does the Christian mind labor in view of the God-dishonoring doctrine of endless sin and suffering. It is irreconcilable with any ideas we *now* have of the perfections of God or the "susceptibilities" of our natures; and so we must be transformed into stoics,—made callous to all the agonies endured by "parents, husbands, wives, brothers, sisters," and friends, in order to reconcile us to their endless torture! But it is worthy of remark, that Prof. Stuart uses the term "*perish.*" Why this? Because, his mind could but revolt at the horrid idea of "*endless misery,*" for such relatives as he had named; and he quietly slides into the Scripture language. Thus he shows the power of truth on his own understanding. "The wicked shall *perish:* and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall *consume:* into smoke shall they consume away."—Psa. 37: 20. Such is "law and the testimony;" and "if they speak not according to *this word* it is because there is no light in them."—Isa. 8: 20.

We may safely say—That no transactions will take place in the "future retributions" that saints will need to have "their social susceptibilities extinguished" to witness them. God has said, "Come *now*, and let *us reason* together."—Isa. 1: 18. Men may affect to despise "reason," but God does not: and he has made no threat of punishment but what he is willing should *now* be tested by that faculty which he has implanted in man. He calls upon us *now* to exercise it, and condescends, *himself*, to become a party in the matter. Does any

man think it can ever be made apparent to reason "now"—in this present life—that the endless and unmitigated sufferings of "parents, husbands, wives, brothers, and sisters," is reasonable or just? Prof. Stuart has given up that point; and in giving it up, has stampt the entire fable of immortality in sin and suffering as opposed to God and truth.

The late pious John Foster, minister in the Baptist Church, England, makes the following remarks on this endless torture doctrine:—

"How every hostile feeling becomes mitigated into something like kindness, when its object, perhaps lately proud, assuming, unjust, is now seen oppressed into dejection by calamity. The most cruel wild beast, or more cruel man, if seen languishing in death, and raising towards us a feeble and supplicating look, would certainly move our pity. How is this? perhaps the character is not even supposed to be really changed amid the suffering that *modifies* its expression. Do we unconsciously take any thing like a *tender feeling*, even for *self*, as a proof of some little goodness, or possibility of goodness? Is it for those beings alone that we feel nothing, who discover a hard and stupid indifference to self and every thing besides? Perhaps any sentient being, the worst existent or possible, *might be* in a situation to move and to justify our sympathy. *What, then, shall we think of that theology which represents the men whom God has made most like himself, as exulting for ever and ever in the most dreadful sufferings of the larger part of those who have been their fellow-inhabitants of this world?*"—*Mr. Foster's Journal, No.* 494.

Thus the "reason" of the most pious revolts against the popular doctrine of endless torment. *Torment* is not the threatened punishment of the Bible to the finally impenitent. That idea has originated in barbarism, and was fostered and nourished by Papal blindness, superstition, and blasphemy, as a justification of her abominable cruelties. Shall Protestants still consent to wear the Harlot's attire; and charge the blessed God of truth and love with calling us to "come *now*" to "reason" with him, while he presents a doctrine for reason's approval, which reason cannot but reject? Is that the way to turn men from sin to God? Reason and Revelation both answer—*No.* The Bible penalty for sin is *loss—loss of life—of being.* It is to come short of Eternal Life:—"Seeing ye judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life."—Acts 13: 46. "The wages of sin is death." Rom. 6: 23. "If ye live after the flesh ye *shall die.*"—Rom. 8: 13. "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life."—John 5: 40. "They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead * * * neither can they die any more."—Luke 20: 35, 36. The wicked will not obtain that world: they come short of it—*lose life—die—perish*—are "*destroyed forever.*" Such is the testimony of the Bible; and with this view reason harmonizes.

Prof. Stuart, in an article on "Future Punishment, as exhibited in the Book of Enoch," in the Biblical Repository, July, 1840, makes use of the following language:—

"In respect to the other class [of Universalists,] or *Restorationists*, justice would require some change of tone and representation. There are indeed among them men of like temperament and demeanor with those already characterized. But there are not a few of a different character, and whose doubts and difficulties are entitled to kind and respectful consideration. *Not a few persons in our community secretly belong to this class.* They perceive the extravagant and obtrusive assumptions of those who deny any future punishment; and fearing to encourage them in their error, they withhold the expression of their own doubts and difficulties, guarding themselves at the same time from expressing and inculcating any positive belief in the doctrine of endless punishment. Thus *they live, and perhaps die, without ever making any explicit avowal of their secret belief*, or at least, of their secret doubts. *And among these are not a few of the professed preachers of the Gospel.*

"It were easy to prefer accusations, in this case, of insincerity and the want of open and honest dealing; and this is sometimes done. To such accusations, indeed, there are some who would be justly subjected. But I am not persuaded that all doubters of this class are to be taxed with hypocrisy and double dealing. *There are minds of a very serious cast, and prone to reasoning and inquiry, that have in some way come into such a state, that doubt on the subject of* ENDLESS *punishment cannot without the greatest difficulty, be removed from them.*

"They commence their doubts, it is probable, with some *a priori* reasoning on this subject. 'God is good. His tender mercy is over all the work of his hands. He has no pleasure in the death of the sinner. He has *power* to prevent it. He knew, before he created man, and made him a free agent, that he would sin. In certain prospect of his endless misery, therefore, his benevolence would have prevented the bringing of him into existence. No father can bear to see his own children miserable without end, not even when they have been ungrateful and rebellious; and God, our Heavenly Father, loves us better than any earthly parent does or can love his children.

"'Besides, our sins are temporary and finite; for they are committed by temporary and finite beings, and in a world filled with enticements both from without and from within. It is perfectly easy for Omnipotence to limit, yea, to prevent, any mischief which sin can do; so that the endless punishment of the wicked is unnecessary, in order to maintain the Divine government and keep it upon a solid basis. Above all, a punishment *without end*, for the sins of a few days or hours, is a proportion of misery incompatible with justice as well as mercy. And how can this be any longer necessary, when Christ has made atonement for sin, and brought in everlasting redemption from its penalty?"

"The social sympathies, too, of some men, are often deeply concerned with the formation of their religious opinions. They have lost a near and dear friend and relative by death; one who never made any profession of religion, or gave good reason to suppose that his mind was particularly occupied with it. 'What shall they think of his case? Can they believe that one so dear to them has become eternally wretched,—an outcast for ever from God? Can they endure the thought that they are never to see or associate with him any more? *Can heaven itself be a place of happiness for them, while they are conscious that a husband, or a wife, a son, or a daughter, a brother, or a sister, is plunged into a lake of fire, from which there is no escape?* It is impossible,' they aver, 'to overcome such sympathies as these. It would be unnatural and even *monstrous* to suppress them. They are, therefore, as they view the case, *constrained* to doubt whether the miseries of a future world can be endless.'

"If there are any whose breasts are strangers to such difficulties as these, they are to be congratulated on having made attainments almost beyond the reach of humanity in the present world; or else to be pitied for ignorance, or the want of a sympathy which seems to be among the first elements of our social nature. With the great mass of thinking Christians, I am sure such thoughts as these must, unhappily for them, be *acquaintances too familiar.* That they *agitate our breasts as storms do the mighty deep*, will be testified by every man of a tender heart, and who has a deep concern in the present and future welfare of those whom he loves.

"It would seem to be from such considerations, and the like of these, that a belief in the *future* repentance and recovery of sinners has become so wide-spread in Germany, pervading even the ranks of those who are regarded as serious and evangelical men in respect to most or all of what is called orthodox doctrine, saving the point before us. Such was the case, also, with some of the ancient fathers; and such is doubtless the case with not a few of our day, who are far removed from noisy and obtrusive sectarianism, and who even do not venture *positively to assert and maintain* the modified doctrine of universal salvation, namely, the *final* restoration of all to Divine favor, after punishment and repentance.

"Can we find it in our hearts severely to reproach doubters of this retired and modest class, who will not even venture to assert what they hope is true, and, on the whole, do believe to be true, for fear it may not after all prove to be so, and then the assertion of the doctrine might lead others to ruin? No, we should not so demean ourselves in respect to serious and also anxious and distressed minds, filled with doubts, which they have yet found no adequate grounds to satisfy. Their state of mind *may be wrong.* I must believe that it *is.* But theirs is an error of quite a different character from that of an obtrusive and contumacious renunciation of all belief in any future retribution."

Here the Professor admits what we have so often affirmed, that "not a few of the professed preachers of the gospel" doubt, or disbelieve, the doctrine of "endless punishment:" meaning of course, *endless misery.* That terrible thoughts on this subject "*agitate our breasts as storms do the mighty deep*, will be testified by every man of a tender heart," affirms the Professor. He shows by using the terms "*our*" that he was of the number thus "agitated." Now the "eternal punishment" of the finally impenitent is as clearly revealed in the Bible as any other doctrine. But here is the foundation of all this doubt and terrible agitation:—it is assumed that this punishment is torment! and this again arises from another *assumption, viz:*—that man is possessed of an "immortal soul." This falsehood, in theology, converts the *death* penalty into *torment—misery—torture;* and then shocked at its own *phantom* it leads to doubt the truth of the Bible testimony that the punishment of the wicked is eternal; and though multitudes have not the courage to express their doubts, yet "not a few persons in our community *secretly*" are thus doubting, saith Prof. Stuart.

He speaks of the "wide-spread" views of "*future* repentance and recovery of sinners," which are "pervading even the ranks of * * * evangelical men in Germany," who have been driven to abandon the doctrine of endless misery. In confirmation of this statement we give the following extract from the "Travels in the North of Germany, in the years 1825 and 1826, by Henry E. Dwight, A. M.," (son of Pres. Dwight). He says:—

"The doctrine of the eternity of future punishment is almost universally rejected. *I have seen but one person in Germany who believed it, and but one other whose mind was wavering on this subject.* Many of them acknowledge that the New Testament seems to inculcate this doctrine; but they find it, as they say, so irreconcilable with our ideas of the infinitely benevolent Being, whom God has revealed himself to be, that, if they believe in his perfections, they must reject the doctrine. Some contend that it is not even apparently announced. To those texts which are generally believed with us to involve it, they give a different explanation in their interpretation; finding, as they believe, philological difficulties in the way. . . . . Others affirm, as one of the orthodox professors, who is considered to be eminent for his piety, told me respecting himself, that this doctrine evidently appears in the New Testament, but that his heart could not receive it, unless he were to change his views of the character of God; and we now enjoy but a single ray of revelation in comparison with the light which will burst upon our view in the future world; and to that, when we to come behold the glory of God, as it will there be revealed to us, he believed that this apparent difficulty in the moral government would be explained."

"Some of those with whom I have conversed appear to be eminent for their piety. I have never seen any Christians, who seemed to me to have a deeper sense of the odiousness of sin in the sight of God, or whose hearts beat with more ardent gratitude for our Saviour, for the great redemption he has made for fallen man. I know of no examples of humility greater than those of some of these

gentlemen, or more elevated views of the character of God than you discover in their conversation. So far as an opinion can be formed of them from their reputation, and from their conversation, *we must look in vain for brighter examples of piety than they exhibit.* They certainly manifest a greater spirit of love for those who differ from them than is found in most of our sects, and they feel very unwilling to *shut the gates of heaven against those who do not believe every article of their creed.* In this charity and love, the Christians of most Protestant countries would do well to imitate them." —p.p. 421, 423.

The love of God in the heart must lead men to doubt the truth of the doctrine of endless misery; or, if still retaining that doctrine in their theology, they are subjected to an anguish of spirit as unlike anything seen among the apostles, as torment is opposed to rejoicing. As one more illustration of this fact we present the following from the "*Practical Sermons*," of Rev. Albert Barnes, Philadelphia; whose "*Notes*" on the Bible have been so highly esteemed. Pages 123-125, he says:—

"That the immortal mind should be allowed to jeopard its infinite welfare, and that trifles should be allowed to draw it away from God, and virtue and heaven; that any should suffer forever, lingering on in hopeless despair, and rolling amidst infinite torments without the possibility of alleviation, and without end; that, since God *can* save men, and *will* save a *part*, he has not purposed to save *all;* that, in a word, God, who claims to be worthy of the confidence of the universe, and to be a Being of infinite benevolence, should make such a world as this—full of sinners and sufferers—and that when an atonement had been made, he did not save all the race, and put an end to sin and woe forever.... I have read to some extent what wise and good men have written. I have looked at their theories and explanations. I have endeavored to weigh their arguments; for my whole soul pants for light and relief on these questions. But I get neither; and in the distress and anguish of my own spirit, I confess that I see no light whatever. I see not one ray to disclose to me the reason why sin came into the world; why the earth is strewed with the dead and dying; and why man must suffer to all eternity. I have never seen a particle of light thrown on these subjects that has given a *moment's* ease to my *tortured mind*, nor have I an explanation to offer, a thought to suggest which would be of relief to you. I trust others, as they profess to do, understand this better than I do, and that they have not the *anguish of spirit* which I have. But I confess, when I look upon a world of woe, filled with hosts to suffer forever—when I look upon friends and upon a whole race, all involved in this sin and danger, and when I see the great mass of them wholly unconcerned, and when I feel that God can only save them, and yet he does not do it—I am struck dumb—it is all dark, dark, dark to my soul, and I cannot disguise it."

Here is an honest expression of the natural and legitimate effects of the *twin* doctrines of natural immortality and endless misery. But few ministers, whose souls are *harrassed* and in the "*dark*" by these views, have the honesty of Mr. Barnes to confess it.

We have now presented our readers a long chapter on this subject, all of which goes to show that the doctrine of endless torture is fast passing out of the theological world. But, with many, the scriptural doctrine of death is still overlooked, and the leaning is to restorationism, or to some other equally unscriptural mode of disposing of the plain testimony that, "*the soul that sinneth it shall die.*"—Ezk. 18: 4, 20.

To sweep away all those refuges of lies, let us begin with man as he is—"*of the earth, earthy,*" —having no principle of immortality, but a probationer for it. If he persists in violating his Creator's laws, he brings on himself death—cessation of being; and that state is *eternal.* Such is the Scripture testimony. The evidence to this point is abundant and full. "Death is the wages of sin." "Sin when it is finished, bringeth forth death;" and that death is eternal: hence the punishment is eternal—not torture, but *cessation of being.*

A SIGNIFICANT FACT.

From the N. Y. Evangelist, Dec. 17, 1846.

"The recent Convention in London, for the formation of the Evangelical Alliance, has had one incidental effect which was not contemplated by those who were active in getting up that movement. It has unveiled the fact before the world, and especially it has fixed the attention of the American churches upon the fact, that *the so-called evangelical religion of England, and of Europe, is infected, to an alarming extent, with a tendency to Universalism.* The 'doctrinal basis' of the Evangelical Alliance, as drawn up by those who had the management of the undertaking in their hands from the outset,—the formula which was to be the only manifestation or visible bond of union,—contained not only no assertion of the 'everlasting life' and the 'everlasting punishment,' which are the opposite destinies of God's children and of his enemies, but no recognition of the soul as immortal, or any future state.

"On this side of the Atlantic, many at first regarded the omission as unintentional, a mere oversight,—though such an oversight seemed hardly possible in forming even the most compendious summary of that Gospel which has brought life and immortality to light Others who had visited Great Britain, and who knew more fully and exactly the state of religious opinions there, and the Antinomian tendencies to which those who there make profession of the evangelical faith are specially liable, knew that the omission was intentional, and that the design of it must have been to include in the Alliance any—even the utmost—latitude of unbelief respecting the Bible doctrine of future punishment.

"Accordingly, this omission was discussed, and was distinctly pronounced upon in a meeting which was held last May, in this city. Brethren of some

eight or ten different denominations had come together for consultation, in reference to the Convention which had been called to meet in London. Several of them were intending to be members of that Convention. All of them had taken a hearty interest in the proposal. When the 'doctrinal basis,' upon which the Convention was called, was read, that the meeting might see who were invited, and might express their assent to it if it met their approbation, the question was raised, Does this Alliance propose to include Universalists? Some answered unequivocally in the negative, and insisted that the omission ought to be considered as merely accidental. But others, and particularly Drs. Cox and Patton, whose intercourse with brethren on the other side of the ocean, had made them better acquainted with the opinions and tendencies there, were confident that the omission was nothing less than a deliberate concession to an unsound, sentimentalizing mode of reasoning, which, affecting to be wiser than the Scriptures, denies that Christ is to be understood as meaning what he says when he speaks, with so terrible an emphasis, of 'everlasting punishment.' The meeting, with entire unanimity, gave only a qualified assent to the 'basis,' and expressed their deep conviction of the necessity of amending it in this important particular.

"The correctness of those apprehensions was made manifest when the Convention assembled. We need not here recite the particulars which showed to how great an extent an unsound and dangerous method of theologizing, in respect to the awards of the final judgment, has found place among our brethren on that side of the Atlantic. When the authentic report of the debates and proceedings shall have been given to the public, more will probably be known, on this subject, than is now known by any of us who were not present at the Convention. But enough is already known to make it highly probable that the original omission in the 'doctrinal basis' would have remained; and that the Alliance, while excluding such men as Whitefield and John H. Rice, would have opened its doors wide for the admission of such as Winchester and Murray, had not 'the American brethren,' with their Bible theology, and their sturdy arguments, constrained the Convention to see things in another light, and to shape their course accordingly. Had the brethren who went from this country done nothing else than to argue that question in the Convention, their mission would not have been in vain. We trust that the impression of the danger of attempting to be wiser than the Scriptures, in regard to the retributions of eternity, will remain upon the minds of all that were in the Convention, and will ultimately produce its legitimate effects upon the preachers, and the theology, and the religious literature of our English brethren."

REMARKS BY EDITOR OF EXAMINER.—We have entitled the foregoing "A Significant Fact," because it reveals what we have long suspected, *viz:* That the churches are fast tending to "*Universalism.*" The New York Evangelist admits this to be *the fact*, so far as "England and Europe" are concerned, but thinks the "American churches" are free from such tendency; though it expresses "alarm" at the manifestation on the other side of the Atlantic; and well it may, because English literature will influence the theology of this country. The Evangelist speaks of the "danger of attempting to be wiser than the Scriptures, in regard to the retributions of eternity" in "the theology, and the religious literature of our English brethren:" and *we* respond a hearty, *beware!* The American churches are justly chargeable with ripening Universalism in this country, if not inducing it, by being "*wiser* than the Scriptures" in their statements relating to the destiny of the wicked. The Scriptures speak plainly that "the wages of sin is *death*"—"all the wicked will God *destroy*"—who shall be *punished* with everlasting DESTRUCTION"—"shall be *consumed*"—"*devoured*"—"into *smoke consume away*"—"be *ashes*"—"*be no more*," &c.; not even excepting the hated phrase, "*annihilated*," as we shall show more fully hereafter; for there are in the original Hebrew Scriptures a number of places where *annihilation* is expressly said to be the portion of the enemies of God, as we learn from "Prof. Pick's Concordance." The advocates of the natural, or *certain* immortality of all men have laid a foundation out of which *Universalism* as naturally grows as the human mind is capable of any just conception of God and the attributes he is known to possess. This was what drove Bishop Newton and the pious John Foster into Restorationism. Let the "American churches" cease to be "*wiser than the Scriptures*" on the subjects of immortality and the destiny of God's enemies, and they will have raised one of the most effectual barriers against "*Universalism*" and "*rapology*," into which their present teaching is fast driving all their flocks, as well as the multitudes of sinners around them. They may well be "*alarmed*;" but it should be at seeing the fruit of their own labors: they have sown to the wind and they may expect to reap the whirlwind. Let them cease to preach the pagan fable of inherent immortality, and show the Universalists, and all others, that without a resurrection there is no future life; and, *out of Christ no immortality.* This course would do more to stay the plague they dread, than any or all other efforts they can put forth. Up then, "American brethren," and to the work, for the storm is upon you.

"MACKNIGHT."—Several have expressed suspicion that we write the articles over this signature. That is an entire mistake. The author of those articles is one who has thought much on the subject, but has seldom, if ever, written for any paper before; while "Veritas" is one accustomed to write but *he* is not ourself. All we have to do is to let those two writers give their views without endor-

sing the reasoning of either. Some few object to the discussion altogether, thinking it can result only in evil. One brother has expressed his feelings on the subject in another column. As to our views, they are to let the question be fairly and fully discussed; believing it can do no harm. If our views stand in the truth of God, discussion can do them no harm, provided it is conducted in a Christian spirit. We do not think Macknight or Veritas will manifest any other. They are both men of sense and of Christian candor.

INQUIRIES.

BRO. STORRS:—The following inquiries are not made with the intention to criticise, but for light, for I am inclined to your views on the age to come; yet I have difficulties that I desire to have removed.

1. How can you harmonize Rev. 10: 6–7; 11: 15–18; 1 Thes. 4: 15, 16, 17, with the idea of Christ's coming a thousand years before the conflagration; as it is said, that at the beginning of the seventh trumpet, the mystery of God shall be finished; and time is to be no more; the time of the dead that they should be judged, and the wicked destroyed?

2. How do you reconcile James' exposition of Amos 9: 11, that the tabernacle of David was built at that time, as he quoted the text to prove that the Gentiles had a right to the privileges of the church, with the idea that it shall not be built till the second advent?

3. How do you reconcile your exposition of 1 Cor. 15: 24–26, in the Two Thrones, with Isa. 65: 17–20, which shows there will be deaths in the new earth dispensation? L. B.

ANSWER BY THE EDITOR.—To question "1," we reply—Nothing is said in either of the texts referred to, of the "conflagration." As to the "mystery of God," we might ask, what is it? and, how is it to be *finished?* The mystery—or secret—seems to be something which was hidden or sealed up, but is now to be opened: it was something "announced to the prophets." It is quite likely that Daniel is specially referred to. Daniel was directed to "shut up the words and seal the book, to the time of the end:" chap. 12: 4. At the *time* spoken of, John sees an angel come down from heaven who "had in his hand a little book *open*." The "*time*" for which the book had been sealed by Daniel, one of "the prophets," should continue no longer; the mystery, or secret was now to be *unfolded;* and of course, the darkness which hung over the prophecy, while sealed, was now to end or be *finished.* And this was *as* God had "*declared*" it should be; for, he had said, in the same verse, Dan. 12: 4, "Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased," at "the time of the end" of the sealing of the book.

Whether this be the true view or not, the work was to be "finished as God hath declared to his servants the prophets." So that we are to examine *how* it is to be done according to the testimony of the prophets. There we shall find clearly revealed that it is to be finished by a reign of Prince Messiah on the earth, under circumstances, and in a time, that never has yet been realized. As to the *end* of *time*, in the popular sense of that term, there is no such doctrine in the Bible: it is purely of human invention—an attach to "immortal soul;" neither having any foundation in the testimony of God.

The judgment of the dead, at the advent of Christ, does not necessarily import that all the dead will then have a resurrection. It does, indeed, import the resurrection of God's "*saints;*" because *then* they are to be rewarded; and the destruction of them that destroy the earth may import no more than the cutting off of wicked oppressors alive at that time, as expressed Psa. 72. "He shall break in pieces the *oppressor* * * * he shall spare the poor and needy," etc.; see the whole of that Psalm.

To the "2nd" inquiry, we say—We do not understand James as asserting "that the tabernacle of David *was* built at *that time*," &c. His quoting that text in Amos 9; 11, "to prove that the Gentiles had a right to the privilege of the church," no more proves that the tabernacle of David was built at *that time*, than Peter's quoting Joel 2: 28–32, proves that all the "great and terrible" events embraced in the quotation were fulfilled *at that time;* see Acts 2: 16–20. Peter quotes that prophecy for a specific purpose, *viz:* to prove that God had promised an unusual outpouring of the Spirit in the last days—that what was now witnessed was in *agreement* with prophecy, tho' *all embraced* in the prophecy did not *then* transpire; and much of it was then far in the future. So James, Acts 15: 14–17, quotes from Amos to show an "*agreement*" in the "words of the prophets," with the *facts* just stated by Paul, Barabas, and Simeon, that God was, at that time, "visiting the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name." In quoting the prophets in justification of the work then going on among the Gentiles, James, like Peter in Acts 2, quotes much in connection, without affirming the then actual fulfillment of all said in that prophecy. His purpose was to show that God had clearly expressed his will, by the prophets, that the Gentiles should be made partakers in the blessings conferred through the Messiah: much of the prophecy remaining to be fulfilled at a future period.

That the Tabernacle of David cannot be built till the second advent of Messiah, appears clear to our mind, from the fact, that its rebuilding imports the

re-establishment of David's throne, which has been *overturned*, and is to remain in that condition "till he come whose right it is," to whom God has promised it, and confirmed that promise with an oath.

To the 3rd inquiry, we reply—We see nothing to "reconcile"—we do not perceive any disagreement between our exposition of 1 Cor. 15: 24–28, and Isa. 65. That there will be deaths during the next dispensation, of some persons, we have no doubt; not of any, however, who are accounted worthy to attain that age, and the resurrection from the dead at its opening.

———o———

FROM M. BATCHELER.

POWNAL, VT., Dec. 24, 1852.

BRO. STORRS:—When I opened the last examiner, and read Bro. Hams' letter, and found that the note you published from me, in July, in reference to the first number you republished of his works, did him good, and that it was like the hearty grasp of the hand, I praised God with all my heart, and can sympathize with him in that large city of towers, steeples, organs, bells, churches and ministers, all professedly consecrated to God; yet the humble lovers of truth can find but little sympathy there; and the plain unvarnished truth of God hardly dares to show its head. I was brought up within twelve miles of that city. It was all fresh before me, as I read his trials, labors, and success. Had I wings I should have gladly mounted, and crossed the mighty deep, and sat and heard him preach the cheering truth of life, only in virtue of unity to Christ. Oh, how it exalts the dear Saviour and adds to his heavenly brow another crown—the crown of immortality.

———o———

"LOVER OF ZION."—The second number of this paper has been received. We deeply regret that it should have loaded itself, and the cause it desires to promote, with that "*Vision and Dream*" contained on its first page. We cannot but regard both the vision and dream as of the same class of developments with "Spirit Rappings." We have seen enough of such manifestations to be satisfied that it is no credit to any cause to give countenance to them. We are deeply interested in whatever relates to Palestine; but, such dreams and visions, of brains that had been excited almost past endurance, as *we know* was the case with the parties concerned in this manifestation, are no more to be relied upon than spirit rapping manifestations. Let all beware of being influenced by them if they value peace of mind and would avoid ruin. We might say *much more* on this subject, *but less* we could not say without unfaithfulness to our convictions of duty in the matter.

———o———

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—An article from Br. Moncrieff, Scotland, came too late for this month. It will appear in March. The same was the case with Br. Alling's "Exceptions" to our view of the "French Empire." We will try to give him a hearing in March, also, with our response. Several articles on the "Sabbath Question" have been received—some in favor of keeping the Jewish Sabbath, and some for the Sabbath as kept by Christians. If it were not for taking more space than our *monthly* will allow, and continuing a subject not exactly in accordance with the object of the paper, we would give all a hearing on that question. As it is, we must be allowed to repeat the apostolical injunction on this very subject, Rom. 14: 5—"Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." If the articles referred to are admitted we should reply to them, and so each would express "his own mind," and likely no great improvement be made.

———o———

BRO. MONCRIEFF will accept our thanks for the *perfect* copy of his pamphlet, on the term "*Soul:* or the Hebrew word Nephesh, and the Greek word Psuche," just received. We may give some portions of it to our readers after awhile.

———o———

LABORERS were never more needed in the field than now. Truly "the harvest is great and the laborers are few." It is painful to hear the calls to come over and help, while our power to meet such calls is so limited. O that the Lord may send forth more laborers into the harvest. The opposition is, to some extent, aroused. That is a good sign. Birds never flutter unless the shot has taken effect. Some, we are told, think we "ought to be burned at the stake"! No doubt of it; but we are not worthy that honor. Others declare, "when the sons of God were mingled together *Satan* came also among them." Such was the inscription on the margin of the Tract "Can You Believe," sent us in a letter while at Buffalo: possibly the outburst of some mind that felt "Satan" in his heart. The devil cometh down in great wrath when he hath a short time. Brethren, what shall be done? Who will go into new fields? visiting towns in the interior where darkness still reigns? We want *men*, and we want *funds* to sustain these men. Who will help now? Let there be no delay to answer both inquiries. Something *must* be done and done *quickly*.

We expect to be in Boston, Mass., the *first* and *second* Sabbaths in March. We shall be glad to meet our friends in the east at that time and place

ORANGE SCOTT.—While at Springfield in September last, I visited the grave of my old friend and brother, O. Scott. I had visited the same spot some three or four years before. Then there was no monument of stone or marble standing over his grave. I was glad to see that since that time a neat and sufficiently conspicuous one has been erected. A base of brown stone, about three feet square and one foot high, on the top of which is placed a marble block, about twenty-six inches square, and seven inches high; on the front of which O. SCOTT is inscribed. Upon the top of this block is placed the pyramidal block of marble, seven feet high, twenty inches square at its base. On the front of this is the following inscription:—

REV. ORANGE SCOTT,
Born Feb. 13, 1800.
For about twenty years
a successful minister of the Gospel
In the M. E. Church.
Becoming dissatisfied with the polity
of the Church,
And its connection with Slavery,
he withdrew A. D., 1842.
And was one of the principals in
forming the Wesleyan Methodist Connection.
He was a fearless reformer, an eloquent
Preacher, a faithful pastor, a good man.
He died in great peace
July 13, 1847.

This monument is the voluntary
offering of his devoted friends
to his great worth.

It was right that the spot where he lies should be designated by this neat, but plain monument. The many precious interviews we enjoyed, and our mutual labors to advance the cause of civil and religious freedom, made him dearer to my heart than any other man. Yet we differed in some points. I withdrew from the M. E. Church for the same reasons he did, though two years before. My mind then was, to organize independent churches, with a Congregational form of Church Government; each church to be entirely independent of all other churches in the management of all that pertains to its well-being. I would not consent to associate with any body of Christians on any other platform. Br. Scott thought best to have a general organization, hoping thereby to extend their usefulness and make an arrangement that would be more acceptable and inviting to members and ministers of the M. E. Church who had been trained up in a general connection. But I always maintained that such an organization would be like planting a young and tender tree under a wide spread oak—it would ever be overshadowed, and its growth prevented. Many who might begin with the young tree would soon weary and faint by being always in the shade; and the growth could not go on. Whether such has been the result, and is likely to continue so, history will tell, if it has not already.

While I stood by his grave, and gazed upon the monument over it, my reflections swept over the past, and there was one regret: it was, that the powerful and discriminating mind of O. Scott had not been brought to bear in defence of the truth—"No immortality out of Christ; and *all the wicked will God destroy.*" I know that he had no sympathy for the God-dishonoring doctrine of endless sin and suffering. Yet, for reasons best understood by himself, he never openly advocated the doctrine of the extinction of the wicked. That he sympathized with ourself on that point *I do know;* and that his sympathy and fellowship continued with me to the close of his life, I have good reason to believe, from letters received from him; though we had no *personal* interviews after '44, or for three years before his death.

"He died," saith the inscription on his monument, "*in great peace.*" I have no doubt that is true; and I rejoice in its truth, and am comforted with the hope that when "the Lord *himself* shall *descend from heaven,*" and "the *dead in Christ,* shall rise," *then* we shall *meet again.* Amen. So may it be.

—o—

For the Examiner.

THE SINNER'S END.

To die and bid a last adieu,
O, sinner is thy doom;
Put hopelessly quite out of view,
Far down in sunless gloom.

Bright stars have gone and flamed again,
In yon cerulian sky,
But ne'er appear those sinful men,
Who in Gehenna die.

The leaves expand when Spring arrives,
With vital smiles and showers;
Each winter-withered flower revives,
When reign the vernal hours;

But comes no spring to those who sink
Beneath the fiery wave;
No more to feel! no more to think!
Thine is an endless grave.

The holy ones in deathless state,
Shall dwell in glory bright;
And on the Lamb obedient wait,
Entranced with pure delight;

But when the ransomed shine for aye
In the celestial land;
O think that thou hast past away,
Like ripple on the sand. W. G. M.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VIII. NEW YORK, MARCH, 1853. NO. 3

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 140 Fulton-street, (Up Stairs.)

TERMS.--Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

ÆTERNITAS REVIEWED.

BY REV. WM. G. MONCRIEFF.

"ÆTERNETAS: *or Glimpses of the Future Destinies of Man:* by William Bathgate."*

The writer of this work is a minister in connection with the Scottish Religious Movement called "Morisonianism": and we have reason to believe is esteemed by all who know him, as a man of decided piety and of more than common rate ability. "Æternitas" has appeared since the "Life-Truth" began to be evolved in Scotland, and no doubt was occasioned by that event. The *natural* immortality has been questioned, and this good man, like others, has come forth to the rescue. We know from private sources, it has been very welcome among the party to whom its author belongs. Any advocacy is prized by those who are interested in preserving a perishing dogma, or a crumbling and doomed institution. A man's friends should be those of his own house. Not a few have already come up in defense of the doctrine of human immortality, and of these Mr. B. is certainly not the least; still we are bold to assert that like all the rest he has only shown the weakness of his cause, and helped the opponents of the opinion he would defend, to see where they can with even more success aim at its destruction. We shall endeavor to prove this by a short examination of the manner in which he conducts his argument in the volume before us.

We have intimated already the general design of this volume; perhaps, for the reader's satisfaction, it may be useful to quote its contents. After the Preface, comes the line of chapters to the following effect—"The scope of the work—the immortality of the Human Soul established—the opposite moral conditions of souls in the future life—the future destiny of the saved—the grounds on which the future destiny of the saved is fixed—the destiny of the lost—the grounds on which the future destiny of the lost is fixed—the appeal of the great futurity to man." These are succeeded by two Appendices, "Remarks on the future destiny of departed infants," and "brief remarks on the probable future destiny of the heathen."

After the "Preface," and chap. I., on the "scope of the work," which is just the contents expanded to about twenty pages, the author begins with the great point, "the immortality of the Human Soul," which he clearly sees to lie at the bottom of his theory regarding the eternal torments of the finally condemned. His wish is to make his volume logical at any rate, but that which is logical is not therefore sound, for error as well as truth may be logically evolved. If on a theme of moment the argumentation be rational and scriptural as well as logical, its value is like that of sterling gold and silver.

Before proceeding to examine Mr. B.'s teaching and argumentation, we cannot refrain from mentioning a thought that occurred to us in perusing his "Preface," and the chapter entitled the "scope of the work." The remark we would pen is this,—surely the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, must be very plainly affirmed in the Bible, for the writer speaks with great confidence on the point, and the appropriate phraseology to express the doctrine is continually meeting us on his pages. We have such language as this very fully scattered over the first thirty-seven pages, "immortal minds,"—"the immortality of the human soul—of all human souls,"—"our common immortality,"—"the immortal spirit,"—"an immortal soul,"—"immortal souls," and, to quote no more, "multitudes, immortal multitudes, find the term of human probation too short." This is a bunch of phrases culled at random from the first thirty-seven pages of "Æternitas," and which are common to magazines, sermons, reviews, speeches, and prayers, but they are *unknown* in the volume of inspiration. Common almost everywhere—they are unknown in the book! Does not this very fact rather suggest that something is wrong, than that all is right? If Bible language will not convey our ideas, there is reason to fear that our ideas have come from a source different from the one whence truth only springs. From the frequency with which we hear of "immortal souls," a stranger would expect to find the words on almost every page of the Bible; surely at least *once;* but, alas! for the prevailing teaching, they are not even *once* found between the first verse of Genesis and the last of Revelation. The words "mortal man," and "corruptible man," are in the book: Mr. Bathgate in his first chapter would lead us, were we ignorant of inspiration, to suppose that we might as soon expect to discover these adjectives applied to the great Eternal himself, as to the being called man dwelling on this rolling world.

We now advance to the main subject, and shall in a kind spirit toward our author, endeavor to show that he has been building a tower of straw, which a little of the fire of truth will burn up from the foundation to its summit. Let the fabric perish:—let the flame kindled on it be unquenchable. Men cannot see God for those lofty erections; they cannot see themselves and one another in their shadows, and the sooner for all parties, the ground is cleared the better.

The chapter that now meets our eye is headed "the immortality of the human soul established." For this we have been longing for many a day, one

*London: Ward & Co., Paternaster Row.

writer after another has tried our arguments, but Mr. B. is the first in Scotland who has manfully appeared, since the life-controversy began in that country, to establish the hoary dogma of immortal soulism. Honor to one who can face what others flee from or avoid! Our wish is gratified; we have here an attempt to do and that from Scripture, what we have often, in various ways, asserted could not be done. We can easily suppose with what a measure of relief one anxious about preserving his old faith, concerning souls, and a little tremulous at the thought that the old opinions were questioned, yea upon the whole validly questionable,—we say we can suppose how delivered such a brother must feel at reading the unhesitating, and manly title of this section of our author's treatise. Had it ran, "Is man immortal"? or "Who will live for ever"? or "What says inspiration about human souls, and human immortality"? the trembling brother could only have had his anxieties deepened; these titles would have suggested doubt, they would have indicated a conflict, a struggle, where there was a hope that doubt would have been excluded, and a conflict declared to be inadmissible. Our author's first sound is re-assuring: the very title must have a tranquillizing effect. "The immortality of the human soul *established*"! If every reader will append that at the close of the chapter, it would be more valuable. We do not blame the excellent writer for emblazoning the chapter we are about to examine. An author may head his chapters as he pleases; if the support does not prove itself able to bear the capital, the more striking will be the overthrow. We see not the writer's presumption, or arrogance in so heading a section of his treatise; we discern, however, the strength of his conviction that human immortality is demonstrable, and that he has afforded the demonstration.

"The question to be considered," says the author, "is at once simple and vast. Is the soul of man adapted and destined by its Maker to live for ever?" p. 38. "Oh! how flutteringly should the soul ask, *Am I immortal*"? p. 39.

As a stage toward the solution of this question, he remarks, "There are three aspects in which the immortality of the soul may be viewed—the *possibility*, the *probability*, and the *certainty* of human immortality. It will be granted by every man endowed with reason, that it is quite a possible thing that the soul which does live, may continue to live, and may continue to live during eternity." p. 40, 41. So much for the *possibility* of human immortality, which seems just as applicable to a midge or a butterfly. They live—they continue to live for a while, and he would be a rash man who would assert that it is beyond the power of Almighty God to preserve them in being for ever. It would be no greater effort for the Creator to produce an archangel than a midge; and if he can, and if he alone can, preserve the lofty being in existence eternally, the same energy could surely preserve the less. In reference to both, the grand question is,—what is the intention of their Creator? What is the term of being assigned them in his infinitely wise and irreversible counsels? All creature immortality must necessarily be God-dependent, just as all creature life and being is suspended on the will and pleasure of Omnipotence; and to determine what he can preserve for ever, or will preserve for ever, or what is fitted for being preserved for ever, by examining forms of existence, and modes, and properties, is to speculate in the veriest cloudland that imagination ever formed. The question of duration of being, pushes itself up to his will. What has God chosen and ordained? is the first and last inquiry. He can announce to us his will concerning the immortality of any being, in two ways, either by that being's perpetual preservation, or by a distinct intimation that it is immortal. Indeed the second is the only way, strictly speaking, in which we could learn any creature's deathlessness, inasmuch as however long we might see a creature preserved, and however difficult or impossible it might be for us to detect any causes of decay, it might, to our amazement, gradually or suddenly expire. The possession of life, is no pledge that it will be prolonged, much less continued for ever. Should God promise immortality, the case would be entirely different, but to be sure of it, we must have his word. Indeed, what we might judge to be seals, signs, or tokens of endlessness of being, may, apart from his plain promises, be things which we have misconstrued, and thereby only manifested our own hastiness and presumption. Concerning the creatures we have already mentioned, midges and butterflies, and all such beings, the world, with the exception, perhaps, of some among the Hindoos, admit that in their case death is not a *seeming* event, but a reality. In their case it is held to be an extinction of being: they are, posterior to that crisis, as if they had never existed. It is only when we deal with man that the real is generally changed into the apparent; that an event having signs in his case identical with the signs in theirs, is yet pronounced to be entirely different. As in transubstantiation, the thing seen is bread, and yet we are to believe it is, according to the Romanists, the body of the Lord Jesus; so here the event contemplated is death; it has all the signs and results of it as we understand it in all other cases within the sphere of our observation, but it appears we must understand that really there is no death—there is continuance of life in absence of all its tokens—a dark cloud fallen for a moment on a being through which he has passed,—a ripple on the stream of his unending duration. One would require great faith to receive the Popish dogma, and the other appears to need a no less extraordinary endowment. All appearances are against the opinion that life continues, and if it does continue, the demand we make is that we shall have the voice of God, so that we can place the evidence of the ear against the evidence of the eye, and the touch, and the nostrils. God can so enlighten us, but to no voice short of his will we yield our reason and our faith.

It would be a sad mistake indeed were we to assert that death was to men what it is to an inferior creature, when it no more ended their being than their birth did. The mistake would be mournful, and could not but work ill to all who made it. He would be our benefactor who would help us to see our error, and, if he could give us the testimony of heaven against our belief, we humbly conceive there is as much grace and honesty in us as to lead us to renounce the view which we hold to be the truth, and must retain till we get better reasons for rejecting it, than for keeping it as a precious possession. But surely it would be a no less deplorable

fact in our history, that we believe that to be life which every sense and every faculty assured us was death; it could only be matched by him who can believe, if belief is not too dignified a word to apply to his mental operation, that a little bread can be changed into the body and blood, and even divinity of our Lord, and yet retain all its ordinary and sensible qualities. How important then to have Divine instruction on the great question—when we see a man die, does a man really expire? When life seems to end has it only commenced in a sublimer sense, and to endure without pause or termination?

(To be Continued.)

Edinburg, Scotland. W. G. M.

—o—

"THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER and *Bible Advocate*," is the name of a *Magazine* commenced by our brethren in England; of which, we suppose, Bro. Ham is Editor, though for some cause his name does not appear as such. It was commenced in November, but we did not receive a copy till just as our last was going to press, when the November, December, and January numbers all came at once. Better late than never. We hail it with joy, and are glad a light has been raised on the other side the Atlantic; knowing there is ability there to keep that light henceforth illuminating the moral hemisphere in that far-off land. May the Lord give strength and wisdom to our fellow-laborers, and abundantly encourage their hearts.

We shall draw largely from their magazine to enrich our own columns, and thus our friends will find, we trust, a rich feast, by means of this aid. We commence our extracts by giving in this number, the "*Advertisement*" of this new *comer*, and an article entitled, "A History of the Present Popular Opinions Concerning the Doctrine of Human Immortality," which will be read with much interest. They are as follows:—

ADVERTISEMENT.

"The distinguishing characteristic, the primary seal of Christianity, is TESTIMONY—is CONFESSION; and the greatest crime towards God, is SILENCE."

PROFESSOR VINET.

This journal, as its name imports, is strictly religious in its character, and will have for its chief object the exposition and enforcement of certain doctrines, which, although not bearing the broad seal of *popular* orthodoxy, claim to be primary verities of the Bible. Ignoring altogether the authority of Creeds, and the standards of the sects, it will appeal solely to the sacred Scriptures as the only depository of the written revelation of God, and the exclusive arbiter of Christian truth. Its name, "The Christian Examiner and Bible Advocate," expresses its independence of all Creeds and Confessions, and implies its purpose to acknowledge the authority of the Word of the Lord only.

While not presumptuously arrogating to itself the comprehension of *all* revealed truth, the Christian Examiner yet professes to be the vehicle of a large and important mass of such truth as is but very partially known and recognized by the churches. Its mission is to deliver a message, and therefore it will come before the public, not only with the lamp of the truth-*seeker* in its hand, but with a fully-written roll,—the copious transcription of truth already sought,—which it will essay to gradually unfold and commend to candid and intelligent truth-seekers, as the true teaching of the Word of God, with which it asks a careful, devout, and unprejudiced comparison.

The appearance of this journal has been partly prompted by the desire to concentrate the strength and influence of a growing number of independent Bible students, both in England and Scotland, who have fearlessly avowed their religious convictions on one or more of the chief topics which it proposes to advocate; and partly by the hope that in appealing to the intelligence, the conscience and avowed deference to the Bible of the popular churches, to succeed in convincing them that no small proportion of their time-honored belief has no other foundation than the fluctuating traditions of post-apostolic Christianity. The narrow sectarianism of religious periodicals generally forbids, not only the occasional utterance of our thoughts, but any utterance at all in their pages, which are devoted exclusively to that particular system of theology which the popular voice unites to honor. On this account, moreover, we are necessitated, if we would deliver our message, to establish a periodical of our own, for the exhibition of those scriptural doctrines which we conscientiously espouse and feel constrained to proclaim.

Our mission may give us that aspect of theological one-sidedness and dogmatism of which we complain in other religious contemporaries. We are the victims of a vicious system of sectarian exclusiveness, which the common consent of Christendom has agreed to establish. Our religious journals are *ex-parte* advocates, not arenas for earnest courteous controvertists to compare their convictions with the Christian Scriptures for the sake of coming to a common consent. We do, therefore, but submit to the conventional conditions of controversy, and become advocates of our own beliefs. Possessed with convictions, like our contemporaries, we necessarily take a doctrinal side; but we most earnestly disclaim anything like a desire to dictate to others what they should believe or reject. We stand aloof in spirit and purpose,—and we will strive in practice, too,—from that competition of infallibilities which demonstrates the Romanism of the Reformed Churches, and places their Protestantism in a posture so palpably puerile. We essay to commend the truth, as we perceive it, to every man's intelligence and conscience, and if our language be very decided, we trust it will not earn for us the demerit of being dictatorial, but be accepted as indicating very deep and sacred conviction.

Judging the churches, not by the theology of the Reformation, nor by any antecedent theologies whatever of the historic church, but by the theology of the Bible, we find them more or less wrong, even on primary doctrines of Scriptural Christianity. There is nothing presumptuous or peculiar in this judgment of ours. The goldly John Robinson, in his farewell exhortation to the Pilgrim Fathers of New England, said nearly two centuries and a half

ago,—"For my part, I cannot sufficiently bewail the condition of the Reformed Churches, who are come to a *period* in religion, *and will go at present no further than the instruments of their reformation.* The Lutherans cannot be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw, whatever part of his will our God has revealed to Calvin they will rather die than embrace it; and the Calvinists, you see, stick fast where they were left by that great man of God, who yet saw not all things. This is a misery much to be lamented, for though they were burning and shining lights in their times, yet they penetrated not into the whole counsel of God." The popular faith in the fixity and perfection of the theology of the Reformation,has become an irrational and dangerous superstition. The same enlightened man just quoted closed his parting address with these words.—"*It is not possible the Christian world should come so lately out of such thick anti-christian darkness, and that perfection of knowledge should break forth at once.*" They who are ever and anon appealing to the Reformation and making *it* their Bible instead of the Word of God, need to ponder these weighty words. Many of the wisest and best men of God have had their doubts in reference to the scriptural orthodoxy of the churches. The language of Dr. Vinet, the Chalmers of Switzerland as he has been called, is very significant:—"Even now, after eighteen centuries of Christianity, *we are very probably involved* IN SOME ENORMOUS ERROR, of which Christianity will at some future time make us ashamed." It is our humble belief that we, in common with not a few Christian brethren both on this and the other side of the Atlantic, have been led to see more than one "enormous error" in the faith of popular Christendom. The Constitution of Man; the State of the Dead intermediate between death and resurrection; the Future Punishment; the Doctrine of Redemption; the Theology of the Cross; the Second Advent, and the Kingdom of the Messiah, abound in radical errors in their popular presentation. That scriptural views are possessed by others than ourselves on all these grand topics of revealed truth, we rejoice to be assured. We believe that a comparison of creeds, even among the larger ecclesiastical communions, now widely sundered from each other by doctrinal antipathies, would be a means of eliciting more truth, and of complementing, to some extent, each others' doctrinal deficiencies. An Eclectic Church would be a more truthful society than any of the existing communions out of which it was formed; but even an eclectic Christianity would stand in need of a careful comparison with the Christianity of the Bible to purify it of many traditional errors, and raise it to the standard of scriptural integrity. By these remarks we wish not to be understood as commending such a process of doctrinal purification, or as suggesting the course which we design to pursue in gathering together the scattered doctrines of Christian truth,—our appeal, first and last, will be to the Bible as the shortest, safest and most respectful course.

Having candidly avowed the fact, that we deviate considerably from the acknowledged standards of *popular* orthodoxy, we shall not be chargeable with concealing our real character, and seeking by jesuitical processes to undermine the faith of the unwary. We believe that we have the truth on great vital points of Christian revelation, and that we have only to place our convictions before an intelligent truth-seeking public to secure their approval. Concealment, therefore, is what we most deprecate; we have nothing to hope from a doctrinal disguise. To succeed in *our* mission we must preach from the house-top, and on the market-place, in the plainest and most unambiguous phrase. We essay to proselyte by the power of Scripture evidence,—to make converts, not only from the ranks of the irreligious, but also from the popular churches, which are weary and wearing away under the weight of their theological traditions. Our success is conditional on Christian candour and plainness of speech. What we have to say, and think worth saying, we shall fearlessly say; no one will find fault with our reserve. We are ambitious to be able to say, with the Apostle to the Gentiles, we "have kept back nothing that was profitable" for our readers. Let us have, therefore, full credit for candor, and we hope not to forfeit the commendation for all due courtesy.

In the age in which we live, our only safeguard is the acknowledgment and enforcement of truth. The tremulous fear of truth among professing Christians, in these inquisitive times, is fraught with danger, the symptoms of which have long been apparent in the declining confidence and fervor of religious people, and the gradual secession from the churches of some of the best and purest minds. Enemies from without are active in their assaults upon the questionable faith of the popular churches; but there is a more active and dangerous foe within the very bosom of the churches themselves. This foe we may denominate Theological Toryism,—an infatuated conservatism of whatever has the imprimatur of the past, no small portion of which consists of the theorizings of a twilight time, and against which, as falsely denominated Christianity, infidelity is ever and anon directing its most furious and successful assaults. Preachers and people have acquired an axiomatic arrogance, which rudely repels all reason and reflection on certain speculative inferences which they have raised to the rank of "fundamental truths." With a strange infatuation the churches have gone on multiplying their "fundamental truths" until, like *un*wise "master-builders," they are fated to see their *faith of many foundations* tottering on its multifarious bottom, and threatening to tumble down altogether. Although it has been plain as the sun in the firmament that "*other foundation* can no man lay than that is laid, which is *Jesus Christ*," they have failed to to see this obvious truth. There can be but *one* fundamental truth: no building has more than *one* foundation: unity in the superstructure demands unity in the foundation. The popular churches have *many* superstructures corresponding to their many foundations, and on these heterogeneous structures there is no possibility of putting the top-stone of unity. Wise people see this clearly enough, but the Churches and the Evangelical Alliance having eyes see not. The chief danger to the churches of popular Christendom lies in their conservatism of these so-called "fundamental truths."

Popery is powerful against popular Protestantism chiefly in consequence of Protestant *concessions.* The conservatism of Protestant infallibility has obliged it to concede too much. The Bible shows a "short and easy method" with Roman Popery,

which sweeps away at one breath a host of its hydra-headed heresies. But Protestants of the orthodox school are at-one with Popery on some "fundamental" points. The Immortality and Separate State of the Soul has been conceded to Popery, and this concession has been turned to profitable account. The Worship of the Virgin, the Invocation of Saints, Purgatory, Indulgences, Masses for the Dead, all stand upon this "fundamental" doctrine, common to both Popery and Protestantism. No wonder that with this among its "fundamental" doctrines Protestantism has built up a superstructure of Puseyism. The most successful antagonist of Popery, both Roman and Reformed, will be the man who has delved his divinity from the Bible, which counsels a crusade against the conceited conservatism of the churches. The policy of the churches has long been suicidal, if not of themselves as religious organizations, certainly of their success as propagandists of the faith. Reform is needed,—yea, *radical* reform,—and reform there must be. New light has broken upon the world, let us see it and rejoice therein. Away with the thick darkness of your antiquated beliefs, which have too long already extinguished the eternal sunlight of God's blessed Word! Let the light come! for we have well nigh lost all spiritual sight beneath the sombre shield of your opaque orthodoxy. The Bible breathes anew! let its vitalizing breath be felt. Bread!—"living bread," bread from heaven,—does the Bible bring us; let our famishing souls be fed in this wide-spread famine of the faith!

It is moreover our conviction that not only the doctrines, but also the ecclesiastical polity of the Protestant Churches—Congregational as well as Episcopal,—needs a searching examination by the light of revealed truth, and that to submit the Churches to such a process would develop a radical unsoundness in their constitution. According to the New Testament representation, the Churches of Christ are religious Fellowships—Fraternities of the Faithful; but the "Churches" of modern Christendom are ecclesiastical organizations for the support of a professional priesthood and the systematic subjection of the people to a servile state of congregational pupilage. Against such a polity we protest as essentially worldly and corrupt, and to whose baneful influence we trace much of that spiritual declension of the "Churches" which is now so universally lamented. The reformation which we seek to promote is therefore ecclesiastical as well as doctrinal,—not only the matter, but also the mode of modern Christianity will be comprised in the sphere of our labors.

While much of our duty will lie in the department of Biblical exposition, we shall yet give some attention to whatever properly comes within the range of our general religious review. To preserve the distinctive character of this journal, we shall decline to intermeddle with many things of interest and importance in the progressive movements of our age, which now have numerous channels of communication with the public mind, and can, therefore, well afford to dispense with our assistance.

For the general contents, as well as for his own contributions in particular, the Editor holds himself responsible. He must not, however, be considered as pledged to every sentiment which a writer may think proper to advance in its pages. Each writer, also, is responsible for his own contribution, and no more; and as a guarantee against misrepresentation, and for means of redress, no contribution involving matters of fact will be inserted, unless authenticated by the name and address of the writer in perfect confidence to the Editor.

"*The Christian Examiner and Bible Advocate*" is now commended to the blessing of the Great Head of the Church, and the practical sympathy of all its members who desire to know what Biblical Christianity is, and to see the Bible emancipated from that hollow profession of respect which popular orthodoxy affects, while it arrogantly assumes to itself the sovereign dictatorship of truth.

—o—

HISTORICAL INQUIRY.

BY EDITOR OF CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

We propose in this first number of our journal to commence a historical inquiry into the present popular opinions of the doctrine of Human Immortality. The notions now current on this subject we believe to be altogether unscriptural, and a most mischievous corruption of Biblical Christianity. The *unscriptural* character of these current opinions we intend to discuss and disclose. At present we are but doctrinal chroniclers,—historians of opinions. Our inquiry will demonstrate that there is such a thing as an hereditary faith, not necessarily a Scriptural faith. We think it will demonstrate more,—that such a faith is the popular faith in the theory of the soul's intrinsic immortality.

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.—THE FIRST AND SECOND CENTURIES.

The Apostolic Fathers, or Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Ignatius, Barnabas and the Pastor of Hermas, are so called as having been contemporaries with the Apostles of our Lord. Their opportunities of being informed concerning the doctrines of Christianity were therefore peculiar, and their testimony is of a corresponding value. Let us not, however, unduly exaggerate the doctrinal value of their writings; for although their opportunities were what we have stated, it is quite conceivable that other circumstances should tend to depreciate the value of their personal testimony. Their testimony is nevertheless valuable, if not authoritative; and by the clearer light of Scripture they may be read with considerable profit. In their writings, as in the sacred writings, we never meet with those conventional phrases of modern orthodoxy about the soul,—its separate state and immortality. "Immortal soul,"—"never-dying soul,"—"deathless soul,"—"separate soul,"—"disembodied soul,"—these and such like expressions are never to be met with in the canonical and primitive Scriptures. They belong to a more recent religious nomenclature. The prevailing opinions of the Apostolical Fathers are clearly set forth in their epistolary writings, where they uniformly speak as if they had no philosophy about the elementary constituents of the human constitution, but regarded man as one indivisible being, depending upon his organization for his personal existence. In the estimation of these early writers death was the absolute decease

of the conscious being man, and he could only live after dissolution by being re-organized, or raised up from the dead. They never allude to a state of consciousness between death and resurrection, but speak much of their hope in being raised out of their graves by their Lord,—"the Resurrection and the Life." It should strike the reader as very remarkable that the Apostolical Fathers never allude to a state of glorification for the righteous in a disembodied condition of existence, when *this* is the grand theme of modern Christian teaching and hope; and, on the other hand, that they so frequently and emphatically refer to a being raised up out of the grave, when the resurrection occupies so subordinate a place in the present popular creed and ordinary pulpit ministrations. The coming of Christ, too,—how they dwell upon and hail *that* event!—like the beloved Apostle, "Come, Lord Jesus!"—"Even so, come, Lord Jesus!" The second coming of Christ was a necessary and cardinal doctrine in the creed of those primitive saints, who, like their apostolical contemporary, "suffered the loss of all things" to "attain unto the resurrection of the dead."

But let them speak for themselves:—"Blessed are those priests," writes Clement, "who having finished their course before these times, *have obtained a fruitful and perfect* DISSOLUTION."....
"All the ages of the world, from Adam even unto this day, are passed away; but they who have been made perfect in love, by the grace of God, obtained a place [by inheritance, not yet by realization] among the righteous, and *shall be made manifest in the judgment of the kingdom of Christ.* For it is written, 'Enter into thy chambers for a little space, till my anger and indignation shall pass away: *and I will remember* THE GOOD DAY [the resurrection day], and will RAISE YOU UP OUT OF YOUR GRAVES." (1 Ep. to Corinth.)

Says Polycarp, "If we please [the Lord] in this present world, we shall also be made partakers of that which is to come, according as he has promised to us *that he will raise us from the dead*, and that if we shall walk worthy of him, we shall also reign together with him." (Ep. to Philip.)

Ignatius, in the following quotation, expresses plainly his belief that immortality is *not inherent* in the human constitution, but a *communication* through Christ, as says the Apostle,—"The *gift* of God is *eternal life* [or immortality] *through our Lord Jesus Christ.*" In his Epistle to the Ephesians, Ignatius writes,—"For this cause did the Lord suffer the ointment to be poured on his head [or was anointed for his *burial*]* that *he might breathe the breath of immortality into his Church.* Be not ye therefore anointed with the evil savor of the doctrine of the prince of this world, let him not take you captive *from the life that is set before you.*" Again: "Men's ignorance was taken away, and the old kingdom abolished, God himself being made manifest in the form of a man, *for the renewal of eternal life. From thence began* what God had prepared; *from thenceforth* things were disturbed, *forasmuch as he designed to abolish death.*" And yet again: "That ye [he says], breaking one and the same bread, which is *the medicine of immortality, our antidote that we should not die, but live for ever in Christ Jesus.*" In his Epistle to the Magnesians, Ignatius writes,—"Seeing then all things have an end, there are these two together set before us, *death and life;* and every one shall depart unto his proper place." To the Trallians he writes: Jesus Christ "was truly raised from the dead by his Father, after the manner as He will raise up us who believe in Him, by Christ Jesus, *without whom we have no true life.*" To the Romans he writes: "For it is good for me to set from the world unto God, *that I may rise again unto Him*....But if I shall suffer, I shall then become the freeman of Jesus Christ, and *shall rise free.*" There is a very singular passage in the Epistle to the Smyrnæans which at first sight may appear to favor the notion that man can live in a state of disembodiment. "He [Christ] suffered truly, as he also truly raised up himself; and not as some unbelievers say, that he only *seemed* to suffer, they themselves only seeming to be. And as they believe so it shall happen unto them, when being divested of the body, they shall become *mere spirits*," or incorporeal. That the reader may understand this passage, it is necessary to remark that Ignatius is here alluding to a very mischievous heresy which sprung up in the apostolic age, under the name of Docetism, or the doctrine of the Docetæ. This sect were so called because they professed the opinion that Christ did not really suffer and die on the cross, but only in appearance. They denied the reality of Christ's corporeal nature, and maintained that his flesh and blood were phantasmal only. Their name, Docetæ, is derived from a Greek word signifying to *seem* or *appear.* Now, it is against the professors of this strange notion, that Christ was a mere phantom, that Ignatius directs his remarks. His language is obviously *ironical.* He certainly had no Scripture warrant for saying that these primitive heretics should live after death as disembodied souls, nor does he indeed say so. What he says virtually is, that when they are dead they shall pass away into mere *phantoms*,—or have no real existence. So far from according with the present popular notions of a state of disembodiment for the soul or spirit, this language makes directly against that notion; for it is the utterance of a malediction,—the ironical denunciation of a punishment suitable to the abettors of so silly a heresy. "I know," he adds, "that even after his resurrection he was in the flesh: and I believe that he is still so. And when he came to those who were with Peter, he said unto them, 'Take, handle me, and see that I am not an *incorporeal demon.*'" Not as some in our own day strangely imagine our Lord to mean, that he was not a *disembodied human soul;* because he said, 'Handle me and see; for *a* spirit [not *my* spirit] hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." "Behold my hands and my feet," said our Lord, "that *it is I myself*," not some *other* spiritual being,—or, as Ignatius expresses it, an "*incorporeal demon.*" Neither our Lord nor Ignatius make any allusion to such a notional entity as a disembodied soul, or spirit. This Apostolic Father treats at some length of this heresy, which it is easy to understand, was of a very pernicious

* The reference here is to the remark of our Lord to his disciples, who were indignant with the woman for pouring the precious ointment upon his head,—"In that she hath poured this ointment on my body, she did it for my *burial.*"—Matt. 26: 12.

character. The following words express more emphatically his Docetic antagonism, and at the same time set forth his views of the future life, only through a resurrection from the dead. "If all these things were done only *in show* by our Lord, then do I also *seem only* to be bound."...."But much better would it be for them to receive it [that is, the doctrine of Christ's real humanity and passion on the cross, of which the eucharist was the symbol], *that they might one day rise through it.*" The Apostolical Fathers opposed the error of the Docetæ, chiefly on the ground that it destroyed the reality of Christ's *resurrection;* for if he only *seemed* to suffer and die, he could only have *seemed to rise again*, and hence their Christian hope of future life, and its grand evidence and pledge, were both denied and destroyed. The doctrine of the Apostolical Fathers was that of the Apostles themselves, that "if Christ be not raised" from the dead, "faith is vain," and "they which are fallen asleep in Christ are *perished;*" because without a resurrection they *cannot live again;* and if Christ is not raised from the dead, but is still under the power of death and will ever remain so, then none will be raised,—there can be no future life,—all are "*perished.*"

The object of Christ's mission is thus set forth by Barnabas in his Catholic Epistle,—"Now, how he suffered for us, seeing it was by men he underwent it, I will show you. The prophets having received from him the gift of prophecy, spake before concerning him; but he, *that he might abolish death, and make known the resurrection from the dead*, was content, as it was necessary, to appear in the flesh, that he might make good the promise before given to our fathers; and preparing himself a new people, might demonstrate to them, whilst he was upon earth, that *after the resurrection he would judge the world.*" Now, as judgment *precedes* rewards and punishments, this language obviously implies that until the resurrection takes place there can be neither a state of reward nor punishment. "It is appointed unto men," says the Scripture, "once to die, but *after this the judgment.*" Not, as the popular Christianity teaches, "after death" rewards and punishments,—then resurrection from the dead,—then judgment,—and then again rewards and punishments! Such bungling and confusion belong not to the revelation of Scripture nor the creed of the apostolical believers.

The passages bearing on this subject in the writings of the Pastor of Hermas are too numerous for quotation here. Suffice it to say, that he uniformly describes the condition of the unconverted as a state of *death*, and union with Christ as securing the hope of a future and eternal *life.* Nothing can be plainer than that the Apostolical Fathers were consentaneous in the belief of the essential mortality of the human race; that they had no philosophy concerning the human nature corresponding to the Platonized Christian philosophy of modern times; and that their only expectation of the future life was by means of a resurrection from the dead. It is undeniable that they believed nothing about disembodied human souls, and a condition of rewards and punishments intermediate between death and resurrection. In this mortal interval, the dead, according to them, slumbered in "the land of forgetfulness." [Psa. 88: 10–12.] Thought ceased its activity, and consciousness, like the expired flame, had become extinguished. These primitive saints, in common with prophets and apostles, looked forward to the "good day,"—the day of the Lord's second coming, to open the graves of his slumbering ones, and redeem them from the dominion of death. Their hope was in a resurrection from the dead, hence they preached the resurrection of Christ as the evidence and pledge of his people's resurrection unto life, and jealously guarded this first principle of Christian doctrine against the contemporary heresies, among which that of the Docetæ was the chief. How unlike the degenerate theology of modern Christianity, in which the grand cardinal doctrine of Resurrection from the Dead is almost lost sight of! The pagan philosophy of Plato, patronized by the popular churches, has substituted the doctrine of an *independent human immortality*, hence immortality as the *gift* of God by Christ is not known; it has taught the world to believe in a state of life during death, hence the modern Christianity has an imported phraseology about "departed souls," "immortal souls," "souls in glory," "souls in torments," of which the Scriptures and Apostolical Christians know nothing. A state of glorification immediately after death for the "disembodied soul," obviously supersedes the doctrine of a *resurrection.* Let the Churches of our degenerate modern Christendom mark the *contrast* between the scriptural and primitive doctrine of immortality and that doctrine as professed by themselves. Let them note the strange phenomena, that the Apostles and their contemporaries speak much of life as the gift of God by Christ, and life obtainable by resurrection, and never once allude to "immortal souls," and "souls in glory," or "torment," at death; whereas both the Protestant and Popish Churches (the latter, indeed, to no small advantage) reverse this mode of preaching,—they preach in strange contradiction to inspired and primitive testimony, that man is immortal by natural constitution, and that he can live while he is dead. Thanks be to God, amidst this doctrinal degeneracy, *Litera Scripta manet!*

(To be Continued.)

ILLUSTRATION OF SCRIPTURE.—"The day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Gen. 2: 17. Hebrew, *ki bium akalek memena muth temuth.* Literally, in the day, or *after* the day, from the eating of it, dying, thou shalt die: *bium*, after, from the participle *b*, which is both a preposition and a prefix, and *ium*, a day depending on the context whether definite or not. *Bayt* or *b*, is rendered *in, against, to, after*, &c. Numbers 28: 26, *sebothikam* is rendered *after* your weeks. Hence, in the day, or from the day, or *after* the day. *Ki bium akalek memenu muth* (dying) *temuth*, (thou shalt die, muth. part, ben, kal. dying, temuth, pers. masc. sing. fut kal. Thou shalt die. Thou shalt surely die. Marg. is not a full translation of *muth temuth.* This illustration is literal, and regarding Adam as mortal, makes his death certain after his disobedience, and yet gives him nine hundred and thirty years to die in. It defends God's word, independent of vain explanations, and proves the devil a liar. N. SUMMERBELL.

Christian Palladium.]

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, MARCH, 1853.

AN APPEAL.—1. *For Laborers.* The cry comes up to us from every quarter for help on the great *Life theme.* Many of these calls I cannot comply with, and it gives me great pain to say, *No.* What shall be done? There are many whom God has given ability to speak, and speak well on the subject. Some of them are statedly ministering to one congregation, it may be in comfortable circumstances; but, beloved brethren, if your convictions are as mine were, before I removed from Philadelphia, there is a pressure on your spirit to go out into a wider field, where multitudes sit in darkness, on this great subject, and are thirsting for light. May their cry enter your heart and stir you up to go forth. The time is short, and there is little hope of reaching minds on the theme of the resurrection and the coming again of Christ from heaven except through the *Life theme.* Will you not then make an effort to pass out through the open door and into the field that God is now specially opening for us? Those to whom you have ministered statedly, ought to thrust you out with deep concern for those who have not the light; but whether they do this or not, ought you not to take up your cross and go to the work? O, hear the cry of those who sit in darkness, and are fed on husks! Have we no heart to pity and help them? We must do it, brethren. May God help us to feel the *woe* that Paul felt if we preach not this gospel of "*Life* ONLY *in Christ.*" Let all chains and shackles, of whatever nature or character, that hinder us in this work, be broken asunder, and let us come up like men of God to the work. But how are these *laborers* to be sustained? We appeal—

2. FOR FUNDS.—That there is no lack of funds in the hands of those who profess to believe the glorious doctrine of immortality through Christ alone, I know, and fear these funds will "eat their flesh, as it were fire," in the day of the Lord. The laborers themselves may be blame-worthy that more has not been contributed to help on the work, by not urging all to give as the Lord hath prospered them; and showing, that by withholding, they wrong God, themselves, and their fellow-men. Now, friends, we beseech you by the love of God—by the *hope of life*—by the *anguish* of God's suffering children, who are tortured with the "*hellish*" doctrine of endless misery, and *fear the coming of Christ*, if for no other reason, because of friends who they suppose must then go into *endless torture*—we beseech you by the Lord Jesus, our Life-Giver, who though he was *rich* for our sakes *became poor*, that you will come up to the work of supplying these laborers with the pecuniary aid necessary to enable them to pursue their work without the burden on their minds, of a family suffering for help, or themselves for lack of necessary traveling expenses and raiment. Shall they be "helped after a Godly sort"? Do you ask, how that is? It is to "*give liberally and upbraid not.*"

GEO. STORRS.

PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE.—A few of us have assumed this name, with the determination to search out laborers, and proffer them *help* in the field of their labors, to scatter light on the *Life theme.* The spread of light on this subject is our *only* object. This we state frankly; not that we desire to restrict the laborers so that they will not feel themselves free on other topics; but this theme is the one upon which we shall aim to give light; and we now call upon all who love it to lend us a helping hand, by contributing to the funds, and by your counsel and prayers. We believe the time has come that God expects us all to show more fully our faith by our works. The *living voice* must be heard proclaiming *Life* in the name of Jesus *alone;* and those who make the proclamation must be sustained. Let all who have a willing mind send funds to the Provisionary Committee, in New York, or raise such a Committee in their own town or county, and act at once in this matter.

HENRY A. CHITTENDEN,
HENRY F. JOHNSON,
GEO. STORRS.
} *Prov. Com.*

New-York, March 1st, 1853.

"MAN IN DEATH," AND "LIFE AND DEATH."—These works by J. Panton Ham, published in the double Examiner last year, have been circulated to considerable extent, and we have given several hundreds of them as a premium to our subscribers for early remittances to the Examiner. The price we have greatly reduced, as we were enabled to do after the *first* edition was taken up. The third edition has now been published, and we have concluded to make a further reduction in the price, in hope that the friends of truth will scatter them still more widely.

We will, for the present, put those double Examiners at *ten cents* per copy, *retail;* or, *six dollars* per hundred. At this price we shall expect *the cash* with the order. The postage on them, if *pre-paid*, is *one cent* per copy; so that if ordered by mail, they will cost you but $7 per hundred. For $1 we will send *ten* copies and pre-pay the postage; or, for $2 we will send 24 copies and pre-pay the postage. Let us have your orders at once.

FROM ENGLAND.

We rejoice to be able to treat our readers with the following letter from Br. White. We have long desired to hear from him again.—Ed.

Camden Town, London, Jan. 24, 1853.

To the Editor of the Bible Examiner.

Dear Brother:—As you kindly write to me regularly once a month, by sending your *Examiner*, I consider myself much in your debt as a correspondent. Accept my best thanks for each and all of your favors. Our friends Dobney, Moncrieff, and Ham keep you, I perceive, pretty well informed of the progress of opinion in England, on the subject of Human Immortality. Every new truth has to struggle very hard for a living on this side of the water, as Englishmen are highly conservative in all matters pertaining to theology. Nevertheless it is unquestionable that the truth is making way in Great Britain. Our converts are, to a remarkable extent, among the most spiritual persons in the religious communities, and each one therefore becomes an earnest missionary in the promulgation of the doctrine. The confidence of denunciation with which we were assailed at first, is sensibly diminished —and I have not noticed any public attack upon the doctrine of Life in Christ, for several years past, in the magazines. Several persons of much consideration in the literary world, have openly expressed their sympathy with us, among whom may be mentioned Sir James Stephen, Professor of History at the University at Cambridge, one of the principal writers in the Edinburgh Review, and author of Lectures on the History of France. He is a man of great authority in this country, and since Englishmen always ask first, not for the evidence, but for the authority, it is very useful to be able to affirm that at least some of "the Scribes and Pharisees have believed."

The letter of John Foster, on Future Punishment, addressed to myself ten years ago, and lately reprinted in your *Examiner*, still does good service amongst us, as a general introduction to the controversy. It has been recently reprinted in a cheaper edition of his Life and Correspondence, and will doubtless open the question in multitudes of minds in years to come. The whole state of religious philosophy in England, however, I regret to say, is unfavorable to our enterprise. Theology is not the study of the day, particularly scriptural theology. Low ideas of the authority of the Bible militate against a reverent study of its doctrines; and an overweening conceit of the unassisted powers of the human mind in the discovery of truth leads to a corresponding distaste for submission to the form of sound words prescribed by Apostles and Prophets. Add to this, that our doctrine is considered *unsafe* for the multitude, and you cannot wonder that we have to swim against a powerful stream. But our conviction is unchanged, that all the danger is not on the side of misrepresenting the justice of God: there are at least equal dangers in misrepresenting his goodness. It must be as *unsafe* to render the love of God unintelligible to man, as ever it can be to prevent their view of his righteousness. The common opinions, however, have the double disadvantage of obscuring both at once.

Since last writing to you, I have removed to London, and have been for the last nine months occupied in preaching the Word of Life, in St. Paul's chapel, Hawley Road, Camden Town, to a new congregation. You will not doubt that there has been a very clear manifestation of the doctrine of Life in Christ,—the first, I believe, made in this mighty metropolis. The neighborhood is as might be expected, much shocked at the novelty, but there are around us some admirable men, who having counted the cost, stand by me, and second every effort by their sympathy and prayers. The chief of these is Mr. Haddon, for fifty years a printer in London, a man universally known among the English Baptists, and lately first deacon of John Howard Hinton:—one who has rendered perhaps more service to the cause here, by the weight of his character, than any other "layman." I trust it may please our Lord to enable me to inform you before long, that we have great success. At present I can only say that numbers are beginning to read and inquire, the fruits of which we shall see in after days.

In the west of England, Mr. Ham, of Bristol, (converted to our views by accidentally reading a copy of the Lectures on Life in Christ,) has distinguished himself as a most earnest promulgator of the main truth. I see that you have reprinted his Lectures. He goes farther than either Mr. Dobney or myself on the question of the intermediate state, and is in agreement on that matter with your friends and Br. Moncrieff. There have been reports recently circulated respecting his views of the Atonement—to the effect that he has become radically unsound on the doctrine of Propitiation, —and these reports have served to assist the adversaries to an unlimited extent by enabling them to allege that we are a set of socinians altogether. But in the first place, I have no reason to believe in these reports;—and, secondly, if I had, it is very certain that Mr. Ham would encounter, from all the principal advocates of the truth in England, the most unflinching opposition, so that

he would stand much alone in his socinianism. But, as I said, these reports are far more probably weak inventions of the enemy, to which *no credit* is to be attached. Very likely he has, as who has not, favorite methods of stating the doctrine of propitiation, which by no means make void the sacrificial language of the New Testament. He is a man of ardent zeal, and has endured a great fight of afflictions in Bristol, from his brethren in the ministry. I saw much of him at a time when he forsook all things for the truth as it is in Jesus; and had the pleasure of being present at the opening of his chapel. In point of zeal he outstrips us all in Great Britian; and is much beloved by those who know him best.

Now, my dear sir, forgive this rambling letter. Go on and prosper! Let us not waver in the conviction that the popular doctrine of the immortality of the soul is the very chief device of the devil *for hiding the glory of Christ, and for producing infidelity by the terrific consequences that flow from it.* It it my deepening conviction that it is almost impossible to compress more of the quintessence of infernal falsehood into a few words than is contained in the proposition that *the soul of man is immortal.* This is indeed strong language, but the strongest language feebly represents the importance of Divine Truth. Truth is the life of God—the word by which he gives life eternal to us. It is unspeakably sacred; and therefore the adversaries of truth are not to be smoothed down in their wilful opposition to it. If the doctrine of natural immortality be so important, why is it not in the Bible: why is the Bible so full of declarations of the glory of the Life-Giver, so devoid of all references to the immortality of man? We want more boldness. The adversaries ever quail before a regular marshalling of the evidence. The righteous may well be bold as lions. How can the people be taught affectionately to love God, so long as they are led to believe that it is His intention to torment throughout boundless eternity all those pagan nations from pole to pole, whom He has himself declared that, "He suffered to walk in their own ways," without sending them one single warning to escape from that impending doom? Blow then your monthly trumpet more and more loudly, till all men understand that it is not a mere unintelligible theological proposition that GOD IS LOVE, but the great fact of both time and eternity. *The Lord preserveth all them that love him: but all the wicked will he destroy.*

I am, dear Brother Storrs,

Yours, faithfully,

EDWARD WHITE.

"THE FRENCH EMPIRE."

NORWALK, OHIO, Jan. 18, 1853.

BRO. STORRS:—I am happy to perceive your attention has been turned, by the recent events in France, to a re-examination of the 17th chapter of Revelations. As I feel an anxious desire that the truth might be brought out and made manifest to the minds of the brethren, I take the liberty of suggesting some objections, that have arisen in my mind, to your arguments and conclusions. If, however, after a careful examination, you discover that my exceptions are not well taken, you will greatly oblige me, and perhaps others, by pointing out their defects. By thus doing, you may remove strong objections to your application of this chapter.

My two first exceptions will be considered unitedly, and are—1st, to your declaration, that in prophecy the term *beast* denotes only a *Dynasty or body of civil rulers, not including the ruled or subjects;* and 2nd, That the scarlet beast of this chapter is a symbol of the *French empire under the Napoleons the 1st and 3rd.* My reasons are as follows:—In the 2nd chap. of Daniel, the great metalic image symbolizes forth four successive universal kingdoms, covering all time from the days of Nebuchadnezzar till the second advent of Christ. Each kingdom, during their day, under their modified or diversified forms of government, comprehends the earth, including *Rulers*, the *Ruled*, and territory. The same thing is clearly taught by the four great wild beasts of the 7th chapter. After the fourth takes the dominion, it has it till the end.

In the natural world, when the term *Beast* is used, the idea is conveyed to the mind of an animal having a body, head, &c. As the organ of volition is located in the *head*, of course, the office of governing or controlling (at least its own body,) devolves upon *the head.* So also in prophecy, both in Daniel and Revelation, the term beast comprehends the prophetic part of the world: whilst heads denote dynasties of rules, or forms of government that control its body. Hence, the form, whether regal, republican, imperial, or papal, cannot affect or destroy the proper sense of the term BEAST, when used to designate the acts of any of its said forms.

The seven different forms, you virtually admit, are consecutive. The sixth, you admit, was imperial Rome; and of course universal; for a decree went forth under Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be taxed. The eighth head, of course, belongs to the scarlet colored beast of chapter 17. That beast is made up of and constitutes the many peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues of earth, upon which the great Harlot sitteth, viz., "that great city which hath a kingdom over the kings of the earth." This language justifies the conclusion, that this beast will be as comprehensive as the feet and toes of the metalic image, when the stone strikes it upon the feet; or the fourth beast of the 7th of Daniel, when his body is destroyed, &c. Hence, I conceive you in error in both points of your application; otherwise the French monarchy must become another universal kingdom like those of antiquity, embracing the earth; which conclusion is forbade by the unerring word of prophecy. Should you however change your phraseology so as to make that empire only the eighth headship, or form of government, still that view would not be

free from objections; because in order to fulfill the prophecy, its authority must become universal over the entire body of the beast, which is the prophetic world. No evidence has as yet been adduced of a reliable character going to prove that such an event can possibly occur.

Another objection to my mind, is, in your extending the sixth headship, down to about A. D. 1806. In chap. 13: 2, we learn that the dragon (or imperial Rome) was to give to the ten horned beast, "his power, throne, and great authority"; and vs. 7 and 8, it is declared, "that power was given him (the ten horned beast,) over all kindreds and tongues and nations, and all that dwell upon the earth, shall worship him," &c.; and in v. 5, we learn that *power* was given him to continue 1260 years. This is a description of papal Rome and of nothing else. Now that papal Rome was thus endowed by imperial Rome has been so often proved, I need not stop to repeat the evidence. The language clearly teaches a universal government exercised by that power. Now, if this universal power was lodged in Papal Rome, where is the propriety of extending another universal form of government over the same period of time? Or in other words, how can imperial Rome be considered a headship, after it had given its own power, throne, and great authority to Papal Rome?

Another objection to my mind is, in your assuming that the ten horns, or kingdoms, (or their rise) may yet be future, embracing ten principalities or small States of Italy.

In the 7th chap. of Daniel, the ten kingdoms are represented as coming up prior to the rise of the little horn, which has already been in existence about 1300 years. The ten horns I believe to denote the same thing as the toes of the metallic image. After their rise, they are recognized as existing till the consummation. As we have but one class of horns of that number noted in prophecy, and as the rise of that class is many centuries in the past, I think we have no good grounds to look for another class.

A remark or two as to my conceptions of the work assigned by the God of Heaven to the Napoleons 1st and 3rd, and I close. The history of Napoleon 1st. clearly shows that the work assigned him was that of breaking up and destroying the then existing dynasties, both civil and religious. His career amongst the governments of Europe was like that of a mighty tornado through a forest. He established nothing. He left Europe in a state of perfect confusion. His career paved the way for the development of the allied powers of Europe, (which I humbly conceive to be the 8th head,) which power did restore order to the broken fragments of the 4th, or Roman kingdom; and has maintained that order to the present time, and will continue so to do, till the beast goes away into perdition. That power did restore the papal head, and caused that beast to live again; at which time she took her seat as the harlot woman, which position she has ever since maintained, and I think will till the end. As was the work of the uncle, (that was,) so also will be the work of the nephew, (that is); to break up and destroy existing dynasties; to burn great Babylon with fire, and execute upon her the judgments written; and thereby pave the way for the introduction and establishment of the glorious reign of the KING of kings and LORD of lords. At all events such a work appears not at all improbable.

P. ALLING.

REPLY BY THE EDITOR.—Bro. Alling and ourself, we trust, are both seeking truth; not tenacious for former opinions, however honestly arrived at or fully we may have proclaimed them. Prophecy was given for a *light* to the Church of God; designed to show it, at the period of fulfillment, the exact position and time occupied by it, that it might never be without a "*day-star*," or "*day-dawn*," to guide its steps. It is not necessary to suppose that the church living *before* the events predicted take place should be able to fix them with exactness; nor for it, when living centuries *after* the events take place, to fix with certainty *all* the events which were the subject of prophecy: this would require more knowledge of profane history than most saints have the means of acquiring. But passing events are more within the knowledge of all; and the prophecies relating to them are what immediately concern the church in whatever period it may be called to labor or suffer.

In replying to Bro. Alling, we shall first note his "*reasons*" for dissenting from our views that a *beast*, in prophecy, denotes a *Dynasty* or *Body of Rulers*, and does not include the *ruled*. His first reason is drawn from Dan. 2d. "The metallic image," he says, "symbolizes four successive universal *kingdoms*, covering all time," &c. "Each kingdom—comprehends the earth, including *Rulers*, *the Ruled*, and territory."

If all this were true, it would not necessarily affect the truth that a *beast* symbolizes merely the *body of rulers*. But we think Bro. A. is not correct in this statement. Nebuchadnezzar is told expressly—"THOU *art this head of gold*": thus confining the symbol to the Dynasty or Body of Rulers. The following words go to confirm this view. "After *thee* [*thy dynasty*; for, it was not after him *personally*] shall arise another kingdom inferior to *thee*, and another third kingdom of brass which shall BEAR RULE *over all the earth*."

Now if the *symbol* "comprehends *the earth*, including rulers, the ruled, and territory," we have the anomoly of a "kingdom *bearing rule* over *all*" *of itself*. We conclude, hence, that each division of the metallic image is a symbol of a Dynasty of Rulers, and does not embrace the *ruled*, who are clearly distinguished, and *ruled over* by that which is symbolized.

Bro. A. says—"the idea conveyed to the mind by the term *Beast*, in the natural world, is an animal having a body, head, &c., * * * the head controlling at least its own body," &c. "So also in prophecy," &c.

But here again *the* beast bears rule over nothing but *itself*; whereas Dan. 7th says, "*the* fourth *beast* had great iron teeth, and his nails of brass; which *devoured*, *brake in pieces*, and stamped the *residue* with his feet": yea, "*the* fourth *beast* shall *devour the* WHOLE EARTH, and shall tread it down and break it in pieces."

Now, does this mean that "the earth, including Rulers, the Ruled, and territory," *devour* and *break in pieces* ITSELF? and DEVOUR THE WHOLE *of itself?* Such a supposition seems not admissible. Besides, this beast is not represented with more than *one head*; and it is not said his *head* did these terrible things; but "*the beast*" did them:

that is, as we understand it, *the body of rulers*, symbolized by "*the* beast," did them.

The seven headed beasts of Revelation are not an exception, we think, to this interpretation. They were designed to give a more detailed view of the various forms of Roman power—marking periods to guide the church down to the last days. "The *eighth head*," Br. A. says, "belongs to the scarlet colored beast of chap. 17." Br. A. has here *one more head* than is found in the prophecy; that saith nothing of an "*eighth* HEAD." It saith, "*the beast* is the eighth"; after having spoken of "*seven kings*"—dynasties, or forms of government.

The seven heads of the scarlet-colored beast are expressly said to be "*seven mountains*"—not seven forms of government; for on them she never sat; for five of them had passed away before she came into being. As the woman denotes the ruling Dynasty of a corrupt church, it was necessary to give the *location* or seat of that Dynasty. Hence, a city is pointed out, as its seat; that marks Rome as the place; and no other place in the world answers to the description; no other city in Christendom built on seven hills or "mountains" has an ecclesiastical dynasty enthroned in it. The ecclesiastical dynasty of the Romish Church is clearly pointed out as symbolized by the *Harlot* woman.

Next the angel proceeds to tell John the mystery of the scarlet beast; and he says—"There are seven kings"—not the seven *heads* are seven kings; but, that he may guide the church to a clear discovery of the time when the harlot is to be executed, he now proceeds to trace out the ruling dynasty that shall be in power when the "*judgment*" commences on the harlot, and which is to continue in power till that judgment is completed. In doing this he saith—"There are seven kings"—dynasties or forms of civil government, and tells us that "*five* are fallen, and *one is*": which we are satisfied was the *Imperial*, as established by the *will* and *power* of the *Rulers* themselves; and not by the voice of the people. *That kind* of imperial power *did* continue down to the days of Napoleon I.—or till 1806—when it was overthrown. Following that, was—as a matter of fact—another dynasty established by the *consent*, if not by the *voice of the people:* hence, differing entirely in its origin, from the previous imperial power.

We think it entirely a mistake to confound this scarlet-colored beast with the "waters," on which the woman sat. These are clearly two distinct symbols: one is the symbol of "*peoples*, multitudes," &c., upon which the woman sitteth up to the time the judgment is about to be finally executed:—the people withdrawing from her—i. e., the waters "*drying up*," as was the case specially in Italy in 1848—she at once takes another seat, which sustaining power is symbolized by the scarlet-colored beast, ascending out of the abyss, or bottomless pit.

The harlot woman prior to that time, sat upon "peoples, multitudes, nations, and tongues": but now she "is fallen," and no longer can hold herself up by the people, and she takes another seat, viz., the rising scarlet-colored beast; or a *revived* dynasty that "*was, is not, and yet is.*" This language, we think, cannot be applied to "peoples, multitudes," &c. Nor can this language apply to the 6th, or old Imperial form of government; for this is expressly designated as one to arise *after* that, and would be the "eighth," though "of the *seven*"; clearly showing that it is after the seventh had appeared, or it could not be called the *eighth;* and as it is one of the seven, *revived*, so history must point out which one it is: and unless some clearer history shall show that our application of it to the Napoleon Dynasty is incorrect, we confess ourself shut up to that interpretation. It is not necessary to suppose that the Napoleon Dynasty should have "universal authority over the entire prophetic world"; if, however, it were so, we might say, that Napoleon I. came near to that, and Napoleon III. *may*, for all we can see in prophecy to hinder, have just such authority; for this Dynasty is only a part of the *Roman* or *iron* power, though "*mingled* with clay."

The objection of Bro. A. to our extending the 6th form of Roman civil government [for we did not use the term "*head*,"] down to 1806, we think, arises from a misapprehension of our language, and of the prophecy. He says, "the dragon, chap. 13: 2, [or imperial Rome,] was to give the ten horned beast his power, throne, and great authority," &c. Now, if the dragon is a symbol of Imperial Rome, as Br. A. here supposes, then it is evident the dragon *continues to live* after the ten horned beast of chapter 13 arises. The language there employed will not warrant the idea that the dragon *surrendered* his "*own* power," &c.; but the dragon *gave* to the ten horned beast *the seat* and *power* which that beast had, not by supplanting the dragon, but that beast held its power and seat by means of the sustaining power of the dragon. That the dragon still lives is clear; for after the deadly wound of one of the heads was healed, "all the world *worshipped the* DRAGON, which gave power unto the beast"; v. 7. Why this worshipping the dragon, if he was not then alive and possessed of "power"? Surely, this language appears decisive that the dragon power was not supplanted, subverted, taken away, nor given up, during the "forty-two months" continuance of the ten horned beast.

Br. A. says, verses 7 and 8, declare "that *power* was given him (the ten horned beast,) over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations, and all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him": he adds, "This is a description of Papal Rome, and nothing else."

On these sentiments we remark first, the power *given* this beast shows it was a *dependent* beast upon the power which was the *giver*. And we have shown that the *giving* power was to be worshipped at *the same time*—during the same period—as the beast; consequently, the dragon power was *not extinct* so long as the "forty-two months" continued; and if that period was "1260 years," then the Roman Imperial power, existing by *the will* of the *Rulers*, must have continued down to near 1806, as we said.

As to the description of the ten horned beast being that of "Papal Rome, and *nothing else*," we are not sure that such is the fact. We think the description of this beast shows it to be a combination of *civil* and ecclesiastical power, and dependent for its *unity* upon *the dragon:* and when the dragon is no longer able to protect and sustain it, then *the judgment* commences on the ecclesiastical portion of it; and to show this "judgment" another symbol is necessary; and that symbol is furnished, chapter 17, by a *harlot woman*. At that time the old imperial power—which Br. A. calls the dragon—has

lost its ability to keep her in power; hence the dragon, or that imperial power, has passed away; and the next form of government must arise, which is the *seventh*. That, we call the Napoleon Dynasty.

The next objection of Br. A., is to our suggestion that the ten horns on the scarlet beast may be the States of Italy, and yet to be developed. He thinks the ten toes, Dan. 2d, the ten horns, Dan. 7th, and the ten horns of Rev. 12, 13, and 17, all symbolize the same kingdoms. Here again we think him mistaken. First, "*Three horns fell*" at the rise of the papal horn of Dan. 7th, and nothing is said of their rising again. So that Daniel's fourth beast has but seven horns, besides the papal one, when it comes to judgment. The ten toes of the metallic image would be quite *too long*, if they symbolize the same powers as the ten horns of the fourth beast. If that were true, the toes of the image are twice as long as the *iron legs*. We have long been satisfied that the ten toes symbolize some short-lived and weak powers that would arise just before the image is smitten; all analogy would require this. In the next place, the ten horns of Rev. 17, manifestly are not a representation of the same powers or kingdoms as the ten of Rev. 13. The latter have *crowns* on them; these in chap. 17, have none. This sufficiently marks them as symbols of other and different powers; and in our opinion they correspond with the ten toes of the metallic image.

We have thus replied as briefly as possible to Br. Alling's objections to our view, and now it comes our turn to throw out a few objections to his view of the "Allied powers of Europe" being "the *eighth head*."

In the first place there is nothing said of an eighth *head* in the prophecy. But let that pass. If there was to be an eighth head, it must be on the prophetic earth. Russia, the chief of "the allied powers," is no part of the old Roman, or prophetic earth. The beast—it must be remembered—is a Roman one. Russia is therefore excluded.

Again: Br. A. says, the allied powers "did restore the papal *head*, and caused that *beast* to live again, at which time she took her seat as the harlot *woman*."

Here seems to us to be an unreconcilable anomaly. A power which is *a beast* and *a woman* at one and the same time. It may be so; but the beast whose head was healed, is repeatedly called "*him*," chap. 13; which seems not descriptive of *the harlot*.

But once more; the allied powers, it seems, cannot be the scarlet-colored beast, because they do not meet the language of the prophecy. 1st. This beast had a *previous* existence—"*it was*." The un-"holy alliance" had no previous existence, prior to 1815. Next, the beast "*is not*." When did that take place in the history of the "allied powers"? And if it has taken place, when did they fulfill the other parts of the prophecy? *viz*: "*ascend* out of the bottomless pit"—so as to have a *revived* existence? And when did such *revival astonish* "all them that dwell on the earth"? And then let it be remembered this scarlet beast, with the horns, is to destroy the harlot woman; and Br. A. admits that is the peculiar work of the Napoleon Dynasty: that "as was the work of the uncle (*that was*) so will be the work of the nephew (*that is*) to break up and destroy existing dynasties, to burn great Babylon with fire," &c.; thus admitting that the application we make of the prophecy is the true one; as this work is done by the scarlet beast and the horns upon him; so that Bro. A. and ourself come together at last.

P. S. Since the foregoing was in type, a friend has sent us the following, taken from the Episcopal Register, of Philadelphia, and from the head of "Foreign Correspondence."

To the Editor of the Register:

ENGLAND, Dec. 31, 1852.

Dear Sir:—The year 1852 closes with this day. To the politician and the churchman it has been a year full of varied interest. The revival of the French Empire, is an event which, in its consequences, is likely to exert vast influences upon the States and Kingdoms of the world, and not less, perhaps, upon certain relations of the Kingdom of Christ. Certain it is, that the Roman Catholic communities of Europe are looking up to the Emperor as their future champion who is to espouse the cause of the Papacy with energy and zeal, and to crush down any political ascendancy which Protestantism may have acquired. Not a few are sufficiently sanguine to anticipate a crusade against England, and the re-establishment of the Mass at the Altars of St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey.

Such of your readers as may have studied the subject of prophecy, will perhaps recollect a curious work of Faber's, published between 30 and 40 years since, and entitled the "Sacred Calendar of Prophecy." In this book the author described the dynasty of Napoleon as the seventh head of the secular "beast," represented in the apocalypse as sustaining Rome. He predicted the revival of that dynasty under a new Napoleon, who would prove the scourge of the cause of the Reformation, and who would finally in alliance with the Papacy, meet with utter destruction. Recent events have brought to remembrance this interpretation, and a few have been struck with the fact that the numeral letters in the word LVDOVICVS (the Christian name of the Emperor,) amount precisely to the mystical "Six hundred three-score and six."

TELLING DREAMS.—Some persons quote Jer. 23: 28, in justification of telling dreams. Whoever will be at the pains to examine that text with the context, will see that the dreams were the dreams of *lying* prophets, like the prophets of Baal. Those dreams God denounced as *lies*, and worthless as *chaff*; and exhorts to a faithful adherence to his word.

Look at the character of the dreams spoken of. Verse 25–28, "I have heard what the prophets said, that prophecy *lies in my name*, saying, *I have dreamed, I have dreamed*. How long shall this be in the heart of the prophets that *prophecy lies?* yea, they are prophets of the *deceit of their own hearts*; which think to cause *my people* to forget my name by *their dreams*, which THEY TELL every man to his neighbor, as their fathers have forgotten my name for Baal. The prophet that hath a dream

let *him* tell a dream"; [i. e., his "*lies*," if *he will*;] "and he that hath *my word*, let *him* speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff" [i. e., the *lies of the dreaming* prophets,] "to the wheat," [God's word,] "saith the Lord?"

'NON-RESURRECTION."

Br. Storrs:—I am a little surprised at the language of C. W. L., under the head of "Non-Resurrection." It is too late in the *age* to frighten men with the cry of Infidelity: The meaning of that word is, "You do not believe as I do." For a man to think the discussion of any subject in relation to man's "future happiness," will do no good, but its tendency is only evil, is saying more than any man has a right to say, unless he wishes to be considered the *head* of all. For myself, the question is, "What is *Truth?*" "Search the Scriptures," saith Jesus, "for in them ye think ye have Eternal *Life;* and they testify of me. And ye are unwilling to come to me, that *Life* eternal may be yours." Now, in searching the Scriptures, I find that *Life* is in Jesus Christ, (that is, all Future Life,) and out of Jesus Christ, *man* is only *animal*. Paul in his Epistle to Corinth. gives man no higher nature than his head; which was the first Adam; "who," says the Apostle, "was animal. But Christ the second Adam was spiritual, and *all* Future Life is in him; they that bare the nature of the first Adam, like him go down to the dust, which is the highest nature they have,"—while those that bare the nature of Christ, the second Adam, "attain to life" by a resurrection from the dead. Again, to baptize any Bible Truth with the name of "*Storrism*," or any other *ism* is uncalled for. Br. Storrs preaches the truth as far as he understands it; but to say that he has all the truth, is saying more than he claims. I do not wish Br. Storrs, or any other Bro., to be responsible for my teachings; I alone am responsible for all the articles of *Macknight*.

As it regards "Baptized Infidelity," and making the sayings of infidel France true; infidels, as you call them, have said many things that are true. But if C. W. L. can show me any thing in the writings of the infidels of France, teaching the resurrection through Jesus, then it will be baptizing the infidelity of France to teach the non-resurrection of the wicked. But infidel France taught that "*Death*" was an "*Eternal* sleep" to *all*.

But the Bible and Macknight teach the resurrection through Jesus, and *death* to all that are not in Jesus; for, "the wages of sin is death; but the free gift of God is eternal *Life* through our Lord Jesus Christ:" Rom. 6: 23.

Albert Barns, in his notes, says, "*Death* is placed in opposition to Life; and one is as Eternal as the other." Life is the free gift of God, but Death is the wages due to sin.

One word about the General Judgment.

The words of C. L. W., "Because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world." ("the whole world: not merely one-fourth part of it,") are superfluous, because they are not in the text.

Joseph D'Arcy Sirr, A. M.; M. R. I. A., Rector of Kilcoleman, (Literalist, vol. iii.,) on Acts 17: 31, says, "He hath appointed a day in which he will judge the *OIKOUMENE*, the platform of the empire of the beast, in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, affording assurance thereof to all, raising him out of dead ones." If the above be correct, it is only part of the world; and that upon which the Beast has figured; and this agrees with the judgment upon that beast in Revelations.

Again, I cannot believe in a general judgment: because the Apostle says, when the Lord shall descend, the dead in Christ shall first arise; and then the living shall be changed. Now, if the dead in Christ rise first, when were they judged? either while they were living or in a state of death; for sentence of Life was pronounced upon them, or they could not have come up to Life: and the living are judged whilst they are living; for they are accounted worthy to be changed to Life Eternal. To say the dead saints come up in the resurrection of Life, and change the living to Immortality, "and then judge them," to see if they are worthy of it, is contrary to common sense, reason, and revelation.

Rev. 20: 12, 15, C. W. L. quotes—"I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God, and the books were opened; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works." John saw them as *dead*, as *dead* they stood before God, and as dead they were judged, and as *dead* they were cast into the lake of fire; without one word being said of their being made alive. In relation to them that were found written in the Book of "LIFE," not one word is said as to what became of them; but it is so plain, it needs no comment. Take this passage alone and no man can tell what becomes of the righteous.

But the judgment here spoken of, being so plain, it is very evident to my mind, and must be to all that are not biased by some preconceived opinion, that the trial has preceded the judgment; else when were the names of the righteous written in the Book of Life? it must have been during their life-time; and when the time comes to *execute*, or reward them, the wicked are condemned; as Jesus says in John 3: 18, and in John 5: 24. He speaks of the righteous passing from that condemnation *to Life*. Here then is the judgment.

When a man believes on the Lord Jesus he passeth from *Death* unto Life; and the *execution* of that judgment is when the Book of Life is opened. According to Thess. and Corinth., the righteous shall awake to everlasting Life. Taking John 5: 1 Thes. 4: 16, 17, together with Rev. 20, and we may have a perfect harmony. The first speaks of the "resurrection of *Life*," and the resurrection of condemnation; but does not tell us what it means: (that is, the resurrection of condemnation). Thess. and Corinth. speak of the resurrection of the righteous *only;* whilst Rev. 20, says nothing about a resurrection of Life either of the righteous or the wicked; but merely speaks of *the execution* of the judgment upon those whose names were not found written in the Book of Life. Now, take either one of these texts by itself alone, and we are led astray. Christ speaks of the resurrection of Life as belonging to the righteous: and the resurrection of condemnation as belonging to the wicked; but does not say one word about bringing the wicked *to*

Life again: and I should like Br. C. W. L., or any other Br., to show me from the Scriptures that the resurrection of condemnation, is a "resurrection *to life*," or of life—or life in any sense. Paul in Thess. and in Corinth., speaks of the Life, and manner or order of the resurrection, in relation to Christ and his children; but not one word about the wicked: while John in Revelation speaks of the sentence, or execution of the condemnation upon the wicked, while they are in a state of death: for *as dead* he sees them stand before God; and *as dead* they are executed without one word being said about their being restored to *life* or living at all. This I consider to be "the resurrection of condemnation."

I remain yours, in the Lord, ever looking for the Resurrection which is in Jesus.

MACKNIGHT.

FROM ELD. C. M. RICHMOND.

GOWANDA, N. Y., Jan. 31, 1853.

BR. STORRS:—The January No. of the Examiner has just been received, and read with much interest. I rejoice that we have a thorough paper devoted to Life only in Christ, and kindred truths. May you be sustained and prospered in your labors. I have no fear that the almost universally neglected truths you advocate will be too prominently presented. So few, comparatively, is the number of those who preach them, the fear is, in my mind, that some who know the truth will put their "light under a bushel. I am trying to preach freely and fearlessly the *truth as it is in Jesus*.

FROM MILES GRANT.

WEST WINSTED, CONN., Feb. 5, 1853.

BRO. STORRS:—Truth is still spreading in this region, and many are being convinced that when the Lord says *death* he means *death*, and not *life* in misery.

The remark is often made, "How plain these things look; it is strange I did not see this truth before; why, the Bible seems like a new book."

It *is* plain, that the mass of the present generation are "turned unto fables" in fulfillment of Paul's testimony in 2 Tim. 4: 3, 4. Well may the poet say—

> "Fly! fly on wings of morning,
> Ye who the *truth* can tell."

These are truly "perilous times," and let us "*stand fast* in the *liberty* wherewith *Christ* has made us *free*."

The "gospel hope" was never more precious to me than at the present time. I am *satisfied* we are *near, very near* the *end*, and I hope to meet you soon in the kingdom of heaven.

"THE LOVER OF ZION," noticed in our last, is a folio paper, proposed to be issued monthly, at Hartford, Conn., by HENRY HEYES. It is designed to be devoted mainly to the cause of Israel and Palestine. We wish it success so far as it deals in *facts*. Terms, fifty cents per year.

SOUL, BODY, AND SPIRIT.—"*The soul is a separate and distinct part of man.*" So some would have us believe. Because, say they, "The Bible recognizes its existences as a *part* of man." This they say is evident from the expressions—"My soul,"—"his soul,"—"their souls," &c. Let us ask—Which *part* of man is it that speaks, when *the man* says, "*my* soul"? Is it the *body*? Does the body talk without a soul to talk through it? If the soul is the active agent, residing in the body as its house, then when the man speaks it must be his soul that does it: hence, it must be the soul that says, "my soul." And if the argument of our opposing brother is good for anything, it proves that *the* soul *has got a soul*. But if it still be maintained that it is the body that speaks, in this case, then what speaks when the man says, "*my body*"? Is it the same part of man that spoke before? If the body speaks now, it follows that *the* body has *got a body*. At this rate we may prove that a man has got at least *two bodies and two souls*: and if each of these is as fortunate in possessing another, unless you tell us exactly where to stop, we do not see but man ought to be named "*Legion*." For instead of being *one* man he must be *many*.

Because the Scriptures speak of a man's soul, and of his body, to infer that they are *parts* that are "entirely distinct," is to introduce confusion, in our judgment. We might just as well teach that man is made up of *four* "distinct parts," as of two; for, the Scripture command is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy *heart*, and with all thy *soul*, and with all thy *mind*, and with all thy *strength*." Mark 12: 30. To infer from such expressions that man is composed of several parts, appears to us preposterous in the extreme.

"BIBLE VS. TRADITION."—We have at last made up our mind to issue this work; and it is in the hands of the stereotyper. We shall drive it forward as fast as possible; and hope to have it ready for delivery by the last of March or first of April. The exact price of the work we cannot yet determine. All persons sending us funds immediately shall have the work at the actual cost, whatever that is. Those who have made *pledges* to help publish will confer a favor by remitting the amount now, and lessen the expense of the work by doing so; they will also please say whether they desire the whole amount pledged, in books, or how many they will have. We wish to know just what their understanding is, and how we stand in account with them; therefore state clearly what you wish in the matter.

From the Christian Examiner, England.

MONTHLY MEMORANDA.—JANUARY.

EDINBURGH, GLASGOW, LEITH.—Our honored and indefatigable fellow-laborer, Mr. W. G. Moncrieff, in addition to his stated ministry, in the city of Edinburgh, has delivered a course of lectures in Glasgow, and during the past month commenced a weekly lecture in Mr. Adams' new hall, Leith. He will not labor in vain. These grand Bible truths have only to be heard to be recognized and rejoiced in. The meetings in Edinburgh are very encouraging. The School of Arts, the scene of our brother's Lord's day labors, is getting too strait for the numerous and attentive auditors that wait upon his ministry. "Our meetings," writes Mr. M., "are excellent; the place is too small,—a larger room may be got yet."

MANCHESTER.—A correspondent of this important city writes,—"As I have opportunity I discuss these topics privately and publicly. I am surprised to find a greater disposition to *receive* the views than I hoped for. I am convinced that a well directed effort would result in their more extensive adoption. In conversing with preachers of various denominations, I have discovered, with great pleasure, that orthodoxy, on these points, is considerably undermined, and that no great amount of argumentation would suffice to bring them to a scriptural heterodoxy. . . . .Wherever I find men with sufficient mental force to shake off educational prejudices, there the Bible wins the day over orthodoxy."

BRISTOL.—The good work is advancing in this city. Our tract labors for the past twelve months have proved a valuable auxiliary to the preaching in Cooper's Hall, where the congregations have continued as encouraging as heretofore. We think the time has come to commence a mission from this important centre, and hope ere long to be able to speak of successful labors in the neighboring towns. Opposition does not slumber, although it has changed its tactics from open and noisy assault to a more quiet ignoring of our proceedings. The truth triumphs when let alone, as well as when meddled with. We regret to have to publish, that a leading *liberal* (!) paper here has turned theological partizan, and joined the persecuting crusade against us. We applied for the usual courtesy, granted to other ministers, and to ourself, when reputed orthodox, of notifying a Lord's day evening discourse, and were refused. Our subject was the Funeral of Wellington. Our opponents seemed determined to try the scheme of silence. To say nothing, they think the most effectual method of slaying. But *silence speaks aloud*, as the Latin proverb reminds us, "*Dum tacent clamant.*"

—o—

"THE FRENCH EMPIRE."—The article on this subject, in the *January* Examiner, we have, by special request, published in a *Tract*, of four pages, 12 mo., with slight alterations; *price*, 75 c. per hundred. Only a few hundreds can be supplied.

—o—

WILL BR. HAM send us a copy of his "*Hymns for Christian Worship*," in sheets or otherwise, as he may find convenient?

Since our last was issued, we have traveled about 500 miles, and visited Philadelphia; Tullytown, Pa.; Paterson, N. J.; and Southington, Conn. We had interesting times at all these places; but cannot now speak particularly.

—o—

THE BIBLE EXAMINER, this month, is greatly enriched by the aid of our friends and fellow-laborers in England and Scotland. These communications and articles will be read with deep interest and profit. More of like character may be expected in our next. Just as our paper was going to press, "*The Expositor of Life and Immortality*," a new magazine, small octavo, of 12 pages, was received, published by Br. Moncrieff, Edinburg, Scotland. We rejoice to see our brethren on the other side of the Atlantic are taking strong measures to carry forward the truth of Life and Death. May the Lord abundantly crown their efforts: we have no doubt he will. Our American correspondents will bear with us for some delay in the appearance of their articles.

—o—

For the Bible Examiner.

GOD NOT A TORMENTOR.

No tyrant is the God of Heaven,
As some would seem to say;
Let darkness from his face be driven,
It shines more fair than day.

The blackest clouds around his throne,
Are wove by mortal hand:
That tongue an endless hell makes known,
Conceals him from the land.

He never threatens endless pain
To feeble rebel child;
And tears should fall as thick as rain
To hear his name reviled.

Their God is not the God we fear,
And love, for he is kind;
He could not torture year by year,
It is not in his mind.

No fiend was e'er so vile as he,
Who could employ his might,
To agonize unceasingly,
A foe through endless night.

The soul that clings to sin shall die,
The God of heaven ordains;
And he who will to ruin hie,
Dies, for he life disdains.

A crown of endless life is placed
Within each sinner's choice;
And that your name be not effaced,
Obey the Saviour's voice.

Eternal love with longing waits
To clasp thee to his breast;
'Tis only *sin* Jehovah hates,
Why come not and be blest?

W. G. M.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VIII. NEW YORK, APRIL, 1853. NO. 4

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 140 Fulton-street, (Up Stairs.)

TERMS.--Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

HISTORICAL INQUIRY.

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM.

Continued from page 39.

FROM THE SECOND TO THE FIFTH CENTURY.

The controversy concerning human immortality commenced so early as the latter part of the second century, and was, as might be supposed, considerably influenced by the philosophical notions of the time concerning the constitution of man. The anthropology, or doctrine of man, of the earlier theologians embraced a threefold division of the elements of his nature into body, soul, and spirit. The language of the Apostle Paul, in 2 Thess. v. 23, was accepted, not in its proper rhetorical, but in a strictly philosophical sense, and interpreted according to the philosophy of the times. Some adopted the dualistic theory, or twofold division of the nature of man into body and soul; the latter being regarded as a substance essentially distinct from the corporeal part or body. The question of human immortality thus from the first became mixed up with speculative ideas, and a phraseology, the off-spring of the primitive philosophy, was begotten, which has unfortunately survived to our own times and added much to the confusion and difficulty of the inquiry. It is of the first importance to apprise the student of this controversy that the inquiry took at the outset a particular form,—a strictly *philosophical* form. The question was rather metaphysical than religious, although it involved important religious consequences. The ancient anthropology lay at the basis of the theological inquiry concerning the immortality of man. Hence the peculiar phraseology of the primitive philosophical theology. The question was not concerning the immortality of *man* in his complete characteristic nature, but concerning the immortality of the *soul* as a supposed distinct and separable part of man, and the seat of the human personality. If immortality pertained to man's natural constitution it could only pertain to that part of him which was imagined to be independent of any material organization, and not liable to the laws of material existance. The soul was considered to be this part,—an immaterial substance, capable of existing in a state separate from the body. It is undeniable that this notion about the separate state of the soul, and its being the seat of personal consciousness, was an importation into Christianity of the old Greek philosophy. The departed *souls* of the early Christianity were the *shades* of Homer and the Greeks.

We are anxious to guard our readers against the very natural mistake of identifying the ideas of the early speculative Christians with those of the sacred writers. The terminology of their philosophy, in regard to the terms soul, spirit, body, flesh, is the terminology of the Scriptures, and there is a danger of concluding that these terms, common to both, have a common value and signification. The locality or state of the dead, moreover, is called, both in Scripture and the Greek philosophy, *Hades*,* the unknown or unseen place or state, as this word etymologically means. But it may suffice to mention here, for the sake of showing the difference between the Hebrew theology and the Grecian philosophy, that while the Greeks peopled their Hades with disembodied spirits or souls in a state of consciousness and activity, the sacred writers describe their Hades as the resting place of the dead, —a condition of "darkness,"—a "land of forgetfulness,"—where thought and memory are extinguished, and silence alone prevails. "The dead know not anything." "In that very day their thoughts perish." "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." Let our readers mark this important distinction, lest they be betrayed into the common popular error of supposing that the terms soul, body, &c., of Scripture have the same verbal value as these terms have in the speculative theology of the second century, and which, through the prevalence of the ancient philosophy during the successive periods of historic Christianity, has become the orthodox theology of our own times. Modern, as well as ancient Christianity, retains the faith of the old Pagan philosophy of the Greeks concerning the soul and its immortality, and regardless of the extraordinary consequences of imposing these Pagan ideas upon the sacred nomenclature of the Bible, persists in avowing the ancient

* The Hebrew word signifying the place or state of the dead is *sheol*, which the translators of the Septuagint, or Greek version of the Old Testament, rendered by the Greek word *hades*. The Greek language being that in which the New Testament was originally written, this word *hades* was also introduced in its Septuagint sense into the Christian Scriptures. The term *hades* in the sacred writings has a widely different signification from the same term as employed by the Greek philosophers and poets: it is the Greek New Testament equivalent of the Hebrew *sh ol*. Neither of these terms express a *real locality*,—they only express *our ignorance* of the condition, so to speak, into which the deceased have passed. When a person died, the Hebrews said he had descended into *sheol*, and the Greek Christians into *hades;* not meaning thereby that the person deceased had gone as a conscious being into some new place of abode, but that he had experienced that mysterious change, of which we are all necessarily *ignorant*. Both the words *sheol* and *hades* signify in their respective languages *that which is unseen or unknown.*

philosophical faith, and interpreting the Scriptures on its false principles.

The scriptural inquiry, as we have already remarked, concerns not the *soul* as a distinct substance and *part* of man, but *man* as a creature of God, "fearfully and wonderfully made." The former is strictly philosophical, the latter a religious inquiry. But the deductions of human philosophy have ever been intruded into this religious question, and have so effectually influenced the language of the controversy, that without carefully noting this fact confusion and dissatisfaction must necessarily ensue. At the very opening of the inquiry, in the discussions which took place in the second century, we observe a departure from the language of Scripture, and a phraseology employed coincident with the ancient philosophy. The inquiry improperly relates to the *soul*, instead of the *whole man*, of how many soever parts he may be compounded. But notwithstanding this circumstance, there were those who, inclining no doubt to the Scripture revelation, —that immortality is a *gift* or Christian *reward*, and not a personal or inherent possession,—denied the immortality of the abstract soul, and maintained that it perished in death with the body.

Among these Justin Martyr must unquestionably be numbered. In his Dialogue with Trypho there occurs a passage which, whatever he may have meant by it, certainly involves the conclusion that the soul is not in itself, by constitution, immortal. "I indeed say not that all souls die," certainly implies that *some* souls die, and if some die, then there is nothing in the soul's constitution essentially independent of destruction. "At the time of judgment," he again says, "those *souls* that appear worthy of God *die no more;* but the rest shall be punished as long as God shall be pleased *to continue their existence*, and their punishment." Tatian is more explicit. "The soul in itself," he says, "is not immortal, but mortal; nevertheless it has the power of escaping mortality." Theophilus of Antioch raises the following question, "Was Adam created with a mortal or immortal nature?" and replies, "neither the one nor the other, but he was fitted for both, in order that he might receive immortality as a reward." The historian of doctrines, Professor Hagenbach, remarks on the state of the controversy at this period, that it had "more of a philosophical than Christian bearing.... The Christian doctrine of immortality," he says, "cannot be considered apart from the person, work, and kingdom of Christ, and must rest upon Christian perceptions and promises."

The testimony of Irenæus, the contemporary of Justin Martyr, is equally emphatic. He argued that whatever had a birth or beginning must be mortal and corruptible. "Life," he writes, "*is not from ourselves, nor from our nature, but it is given or bestowed according to the grace of God;* and therefore he who preserves this gift of life and returns thanks to him who bestows it, *he shall receive length of days for ever and ever.* But he who rejects it and proves unthankful to his Maker for creating him, and will not know him who bestows it, *he deprives himself of the gift of duration to all eternity.* And therefore the Lord speaks thus of such unthankful persons, 'If you have not been faithful in that which is least, who will commit much to you?' intimating thereby unto us that they who are unthankful to him with respect to this short transitory life, which is his gift, the effect of his bounty, *shall be most justly deprived of length of days in the world to come.*" No language can be more explicit than the foregoing. It expresses, as definitely as language can, that man has no constitutional immortality, and that unless "born again" of "incorruptible seed,"—the "word of God which liveth and abideth for ever," he must without doubt perish everlastingly.

The theory of Tertullian, who flourished in the third century, exhibits the extent to which speculative inquiry went in connection with the doctrine of immortality. This celebrated Father put forth a new doctrine, as much physiological as theological, in which he maintained that the human soul was propagated, like the body, by ordinary but distinct generation,—the soul being begotten by the soul, as the body by the body, of the parent. He tells us that God made Adam's soul "*matricem omnium*,"—the fountain or source of all souls. His theory is known by the name Traducianism (*per traducem.*) Dodwell justly reasons that Tertullian's opinions concerning the soul "are inconsistent with its independence upon purer matter, though it might survive the grosser organical body of our visible humanity.....If therefore," he argues, "it be preserved from actual mortality it must be by the like interposition of an extraordinary providence, as that by which our bodies* themselves are to be immortalized after the resurrection."

In the following century the Traducianism of Tertullian was opposed by the doctrine that the soul had its creation immediately from God, and was neither propagated by traduction, nor born together with the body, as Lactantius and others supposed. This new theory is denominated Creationism. The difficulties involved in these respective systems inclined many theologians, among whom was Augustine, to ignore the controversy altogether, and declare their opinion that human science found a limit in this direction, beyond which it was impossible to pass. The two theories were consequently tolerated as legitimate speculations, and although they necessarily involved the natural *mortality* of the soul, were not on this account pronounced heretical. "It is plain," writes Dodwell, "that they did not *then*, in the fifth century, believe this doctrine of the *soul's natural mortality* heretical, so long as there was no question made of its being *actually immortal.*" The strength and influence of both parties led to something like a mutual compromise, nevertheless the orthodox doctrine was that the soul is constitutionally immortal. Lactantius contended that immortality was not the natural property of the soul, but the reward of virtue; and in this opinion he was fortified by the testimony of the earlier Greek theologians, who affirm that the Hebrews did not believe in the constitutional immortality of man, but considered it dependent upon a virtuous character. Nemesius, a Greek philosopher of the fourth century, and a convert to Christianity, afterwards made Bishop of Emesa, in Phœnicia, also testifies to the faith of the Hebrews:— "The Hebrews confessedly say that man was created from the first neither mortal nor immortal,

* Dodwell fell into the common error of accepting the philosophical distinction between soul and body, and departs from the phraseology of Scripture, which nowhere speaks of resurrection of the *body*, but of the *dead.*

but capable of either nature; that should he incline to fleshly passions, he might incur the fate of the flesh; but if he aspired after spiritual excellence, he should be esteemed worthy of immortality."

Origen differed both from Tertullian and the Creationists, and gave it as his opinion that human souls had a pre-existence. By this theory he easily disposed of the objection that what had a beginning could not be inherently immortal. "Among the primitive Christians," says Dodwell, "this doctrine of Origen was taken for very singular, nor did the great authority of the man recommend it to many among them. They generally condemned it in Plato himself. They generally took it for a maxim in arguing, that whatever had a beginning could not be necessarily or naturally immortal. On this principle they owned none immortal but God himself,—no, not the angels."

Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, informs us of a sect existing in the third century, in Arabia, who denied the natural immortality of the soul. They appear to have been of sufficient importance to give occasion to "a considerable council," to take into consideration what at this period among professional theologians was pronounced a heresy. "These," writes Eusebius, "asserted that the human soul, as long as the present state of the world existed, perished at death and died with the body, but that it would be raised again with the body at the time of the resurrection." Against the opinions of these primitive Arabians, the theological powers of Origen, the great champion of the nascent orthodoxy, were enlisted, and who appears to have been successful in overturning their previous faith, and bringing them to the persuasion of the new Platonism, or philosophical Christianity, which was rapidly extending itself over the ancient Christendom.

Some of the Fathers of this period, among whom were Cyprian, Arnobius, and Athanasius, considered the *soul* to be naturally mortal, and ascribed its immortality to the communication of the Divine Spirit. It must, however, be acknowledged that the doctrine of the Church,—the orthodox, and which was daily becoming the popular doctrine was, that the soul is immortal. Subtile disputes in theology were, in those earlier times, as in our own, mostly confined to professional theologians, the "laity" not concerning themselves with these disputes, grew in a less discriminating and more dogmatic faith. The immortality of the soul, in some sense or other, was the orthodox, if not the universal, belief.

In concluding our sketch of the state of the doctrine of immortality at the close of the fifth century, it is scarcely necessary to remind the reader of the very *speculative* character of the period comprised in this section. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul took its rise in mere philosophical conjecture; was debated as a question of human science, and established upon this necessarily imperfect basis. Its introduction into the earlier Christianity is attributable to the influence of the Greek and Latin Fathers. Gieseler, in his Compendium of Ecclesiastical History, acknowledges this influence in the doctrinal theology of this period. "A speculative treatment of Christian doctrine was," he says, "generally indispensable, if Christianity should be accessible to the philosophical culture of the times, and was rendered unavoidable by the measures of the Gnostics. It could only proceed from Platonism, which of all philosophical systems stood the nearest to Christianity. While many Platonic philosophers were brought over to Christianity by this internal relation, they received the latter as the most perfect philosophy, and retained, with their philosophical mantle, their philosophical turn of mind also. They set out with this principle * * * that the truth taught by Plato was derived from Moses and the prophets. The arbitrary mode of interpretation then current furnished them with the means of proving their views, even from numerous passages of the Old Testament, which they could use, indeed, only in the Septuagint version. Thus, then, they overvalued even the actual agreement of Plato with Christianity, and believed that they found many a Platonic idea in the latter, which in reality they themselves had first introduced into it."

(To be Continued.)

———o———

"THE EXPOSITOR OF LIFE AND IMMORTALITY." This is the title of a magazine started by our fellow-laborer, W. S. MONCRIEFF, in Edinburgh, Scotland. We rejoice in its appearance, and hope it may be abundantly sustained and widely circulated. We give this month his "*Introductory Statement*," and two other articles, *editorial*,—from his magazine—entitled "*Jesus the Life*," and "*Christian Love*." They are the following:—

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT.

This magazine has originated partly in a desire to awaken attention to the Scriptural views of "Life and Immortality," by a wish to meet, as far as possible, the demands of the increasing number of inquirers throughout the country for light on these great Bible truths, and others that are inseparably connected with them. The cause in which we are engaged in one of pressing and incalculable moment, and the friends of the "Life-Truth" are anxious that others may enjoy the openings up of Scripture, which have had so delightful an effect on their own minds. We begin depending on God; we express to Him our gratitude for having opened to us another door of usefulness. May he grant such a blessing as shall cheer his servants engaged in this undertaking for his glory; may he use this work for the enlightenment of his people, and in drawing sinners to the peace, and joy, and hope of salvation. He, in the greatness of his love, says to each sinful child, "Why will ye die?" We shall repeat our Father's words again and again to those who are continuing in rebellion, and shew them that blessed Redeemer who gave his flesh "for the life of the world," of which they are members.

We can make no promises as to the future; all we can say is that it is our wish, and it shall be our aim, to make the Magazine fit for its mission. The articles, as a general rule, will be short, simple, varied, and as uncontroversial as possible. Our design is to speak the Truth plainly and fearlessly; our intention also is to utter it in love. We firmly believe that the spirit of truth is calm and kind; yea, that Religion itself may be summed up in love. "Though I have the gift of prophecy and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing," 1 Cor. 13: 2.

Having been in error ourselves on the very subjects we are to explain, we feel for those who remain where we were; we feel for them in their manifold difficulties, and even in their suspicions of those who, like ourselves, are wont to publish "strange things," and we would esteem it an honor to be employed in removing their hindrances, and in bringing to them better and more sanctifying views of God, and of gospel truth in general. When we try to speak in love, we respectfully ask from those whom we address, a patient and candid hearing. For the truth we have no fear; but, let it be acknowledged frankly, we tremble lest it may suffer in our hands. To superiority and infallibility we make no pretensions; when we pen a word that reasonably offends, and in weakness such may actually happen, let our readers remember we are men: and should they gather benefit from our writings, we would have them to bear in recollection that we have given them only what we have received. Let the God of Truth and mercy obtain all the glory.

There is already a Magazine in existence, *The Christian Examiner and Bible Advocate*, under able editorial management, extending the sublime doctrine of Life and Immortality through the Lord Jesus, and we wish it to be distinctly understood that we rise not to oppose or rival that periodical, but on the contrary, to second its efforts. There is ample field for both periodicals. Each in its place, we fondly trust, will do service over which many will give thanks. The *Examiner* is right worthy of support; our wish is that its circulation may increase with rapidity. It has done good already, even though its months are but few; a great deal more, we firmly believe, will be produced by its agency.

Along with the original articles which will appear in each number of *The Expositor*, it is designed to furnish select and useful extracts from larger works that have appeared on the Life Question; there will also be quotations taken from other religious books, which may be thought calculated to profit the readers. In this way we hope to serve not a few of our friends, for the works referred to are, in general, beyond the reach of limited means, and often designed more for what are styled professional than general readers.

It seems very unnecessary to write, that, had not friends generously come forward with supplies, *The Expositor* could not, in present circumstances, have appeared; for, a little reflection may convince any one, the business expense connected with it is far from being small.

The Editor and others on whom will devolve much labor, are all working without recompense, and hence those who sympathise with us in this undertaking, can the more boldly be asked to help on the sale of our Magazine. We cast it upon them wherever they may be; and if the past may be held to be a token of the future, our hopes of their efficient and prayerful co-operation will not be disappointed. Brethren! our end is one; each must work in his own sphere. You see what we want, what is needed, will you help? Work, fellow-heirs! the Lord is at hand; the crown of glory is our promised reward.

"Party men always hate a slightly differing friend more than a downright enemy."—*Colridge.*

JESUS THE LIFE.

In reading the New Testament every one must notice how frequently the words "life," "live," "live for ever," "eternal life," "everlasting life," occur. So common are they that one can hardly open a page at random without meeting them. Jesus himself said more than once, "I am the life;" and "eternal life" is invariably connected with a cordial reception of him as the Saviour, and a full submission to his will. Language which is found so often on the lips of Jesus, and in the pages of his apostolic servants, must be important, we would say unutterably momentous. Without a clear notion of its import much of the Book will remain in comparative obscurity, and a great personal loss be sustained by every reader and disciple of Christianity. Let us try to get at the meaning of these words. As a safe guide let us follow the direction of Hooker, in our interpretations on this and all occasions:—"Hold it," he says, "for a most infallible rule, in exposition of sacred Scripture, that where a literal construction will stand, the furthest from the letter is commonly the worst. There is nothing more dangerous than this licentious and deluding art, which changes the meaning of words, as Alchymes does, or would do, the substance of metals, makes of anything what it lists, and in the end brings all truth to nothing." What then is the literal meaning of "Life?" The Greek noun rendered life in such expressions as "I am the life," "everlasting life," and the like, is *zoe*, of which the primary sense is "physical life, and existence, as opposed to death and non-existence." All admit it is so used in verses like these, "He giveth to all life (*zoen*) and breath and all things," Acts 17: 25; and "If in this life (*zoe*) only we have hope in Christ," &c., 1 Cor. 15: 19. Every person understands such phrases as these so well—"the man is alive yet," "save my life," "he lost his life there," that no explanation can make the import of "life" when so used, any clearer. Life has its universally known signs; so has death, its opposite. Now, when the blessed Jesus is called the "Life," and the giver of "everlasting life," it is very common to understand these terms as signifying not life literally, but a kind of it, that is, happiness, and happiness to run on without a close. In other words, the literal idea of life is excluded, and the secondary, or figurative one, of happiness preferred. Thus a very great change is effected on the representation of the Book, for if the Saviour wishes to be understood as the life, that is, as the author of life, in its primary sense of conscious existence, and if he intended us by "eternal life" to receive the meaning of unending conscious being, we certainly lessen the force of his words greatly, when we regard him as only a bestower of eternal blessedness. Following that most excellent rule afforded us by the distinguished writer named above, we proceed to ask if "a literal construction will stand?" That is, in the case before us, must we set aside the literal for the figurative? Must we reject the simple idea of *being* as the gift of Jesus to his followers? We verily believe the literal will stand, for this reason, that unless we get life, and everlasting life from Jesus, in its primary sense, then we must ultimately enter on a condition of eternal non-existence. Had men been naturally immortal, then having in

themselves life, or being heirs of ceaseless existence, they could in no way require a Saviour to come and yield them what they had already. But in Scripture where are we pronounced immortal? The Book uses language of a thoroughly opposite character, as when it speaks of us as "mortal," and "corruptible;" as when it declares "all flesh is grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass;" and to add no more, when it exhorts us to "seek for immortality." Rom. 2: 7. Were we possessed of inherent immortality—a life that would go on unwinding and unwinding for ever, we might need to seek for immortal or eternal happiness, but not immortality itself. In consequence of assuming that men are to live for ever, as surely as God himself, no wonder that the gospel "life" has been set aside in its primary import, and happiness, ceaseless happiness, alone been held forth as the great blessing to be obtained through the interposition of the Son of God. The whole mistake, and a melancholy one it has been, has proceeded from the assumption just mentioned, and in what that originated we stop not at present to consider. For the honor of the Lord Jesus, for the consistency of his teaching, for the unspeakable delight of his people, for the enlightenment of poor sinners, let us no longer assume that men are immortal beings.—On the withdrawal of this assumption a great erection of misapprehension, and not a little superstition, perishes; the gift of God beams forth in richest glory. and the universe is bathed in a mellower light. Jesus imparts life, and endless life to his friends; happiness no doubt he gives also, but being—immortal, incorruptible being—through a resurrection from among the dead, is the grand product of his philanthropy and power. His mission among men had a view to the future especially. It was among the dying and the dead that he proclaimed "I am the life;" "he that believeth on me though he were dead," though he must die, "yet shall he live," and "live for ever." In a world of immortals he might have given the announcement, "I am the blessedness;" among men who had no life in themselves, whose breath was in their nostrils, who were hastening to the grave, he was required as the LIFE-GIVER—one who would resurrect the inmates of the sepulchre, and cause his saints to inherit an angel-like and deathless state of being. Let us then disclose him as the Life of men; and assure the Christless that eternity instead of being their home will be their grave! "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so was the Son of Man lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3: 14, 15. The bitten Israelites needed life; all that they had they would have given to escape impending death; without money life was restored to them, their days were prolonged, by looking at the brazen serpent. So now it is life, life from the dead,—an immortal and incorruptible resurrection—that is needed by men, and lo! it is reachable, for Jesus is "The Resurrection and the Life." Ere long he will impart to his followers eternal life, and they will continue in being because his years are unending. "God so loved the world," each of us on earth, "that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." It was love divine that wrought the miracle in the desert; mercy shown there in benign effulgence, but oh! how it radiates from Jesus, and from his cross, and from Joseph's tomb. The Israelites had their existence continued for a brief space of time, and then the dark foe of man flapped his wings over them when his talons entered their vitals; the life set before you in the gospel of heaven is one that death will never reach. Life and love radiate from the Divine Throne, they are concentrated in the Son of the Blessed, and the blaze is excessively glorious. The proof that God loves you is discoverable in this fact that there is a Jesus; the evidence that the Infinite and All-merciful Parent wishes you to be immortal in his universe, and perpetually in bliss, is that Jesus sits behind yon skiey veil, and that his voice comes to your ears burdened with sorrow and desire, "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life."

CHRISTIAN LOVE.

The gracious feeling of charity or love delights itself in God, and in the happiness of man. It is opposed to selfishness, which leads a person to make an idol of himself, and withhold supreme reverence from his Creator; to exclude all sympathy with his fellow-beings, and often to treat them with positive injustice and cruelty. To the absence of love for God we are authorized by Revelation to trace all blasphemy, impiety, and idolatry existing on earth; and to absence of all love for man we are warranted by the same authority, to trace envy, avarice, malignity, and oppression in its thousand forms. The gospel of Jesus is the grand antagonist of this baneful selfishness; it inculcates and inspires affection for God and man. Love is the very essence of his religion. A selfish Christian is a pure contradiction. A Christian cannot be destitute of love for God and his fellow-creature. When living christianity is thus synonymous with love, we need not wonder that "charity" is so often inculcated in the sacred volume, and so highly extolled. Looking up to God, who himself is love, the inspired writers with one voice exclaim, "O love the Lord all ye his saints." Looking abroad on the Christian world, the inspired servants of the Redeemer proclaim these exhortations,—"Above all things have fervent charity," or love, "among yourselves." "Seeing you have purified your souls," or yourselves, "in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that you love one another with a pure heart fervently;" and the great command of our Master is, that we should "love our neighbors as ourselves;" be good Samaritans, as he taught us in his parable.

"The fruit of the Spirit is love." They who are in Jesus have his spirit, and brotherly kindness and charity are among the beautiful and heavenly products of grace. Unless we live in love we are unpardoned,—we are not of God. Man-love springs up side by side with the love of God in the heart. Whoever loves God, and this affection is wrought in us by understanding his love for us as it is manifested especially in Jesus, is constrained to feel kindly toward his brother. The benevolence of the gospel, is the product of the gospel. It is a love to man for God's sake; he is its spring, its support, and his glory is its aim. A fine illustration of this truth is given by Mr. Moffat, in his

work on Africa, in the case of Africaner, whose life he records. Before his conversion, he was alike the enemy of God and man; fierce, savage, revengeful, and bloody, his name was terror, and like the lion of his native wilds, he roamed about only to plunder and destroy. But when the doctrine of the Cross melted his heart, there was a blessed transformation speedily accomplished. The lion became a lamb,—no more plundering, no more slaughter; the doctrine that moved him to love the merciful Jehovah, filled his bosom with benevolence to man. Having been born into the family of heaven, he loved the brethren with especial affection; the yearning of pure and holy philanthrophy characterised his being. Oh! happy change; when will the world be filled with hearts like his?

As soon as we discover that a wrong has been done us, we naturally feel angry, and this feeling, if not crushed, will rise into revenge, and be manifested probably in some of the forms of retaliation in our power. We see this process exemplified in the inferior animals, when an injury has been inflicted by any of their number; and their Creator has actually endowed them with weapons, so to speak, by which to defend themselves, and chastise their enemies. The serpent has a sting, the bull horns, the tiger has claws, and in their case, in consequence of their constitution, the infliction of an injury and an effort at revenge, are purely instinctive and simultaneous. In savage life, and in some men who are supposed to be civilized, there is a striking and sad resemblance to the inferior creatures around them, they boil with rage, utter their wrath in horrid and often fiendish imprecations, they glory in returning the wrong in an aggravated form. Even though we may have no resemblance to these excessively wicked men, we all experience, at least for the moment, a desire, it may be feeble, yet still the desire is felt, to punish the person who willingly affords us pain. Now this feeling of resentment, and particularly if allowed to assume the form of revenge, is peculiarly abhorent from the genius of Christianity. We are to forgive our enemies; to love them, to pray for them that despitefully use us and persecute us. We are to imitate our Master's example, who pardoned even the man who denied him with oaths; who, when on the cross, prayed for his murderers.

Love in the heart will expel all anger and malice, and terminate all evil speaking. Love cheers the home; love irradiates and tranquillizes the church. It is of divine power, and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God and God in him. Heaven is the home, the temple of love; and in proportion as we love, we know the sympathies, the joys, and even the sublime sorrows of that distant shore.

———o———

"The Provisionary Committee" acknowledge the receipt of $5 from a sister in Kenosha, Wis. Any remittances will be acknowledged in the Examiner, but the *names* of doners will not be published, except specially requested. Eld. J. S. White, of Worcester, Mass., will devote a portion of his time to preaching under the patronage of the Prov. Com., after the first of May. We hope to announce the names of others before long. Will the friends heed our call in the last Examiner relating to this work? *Something must be done.* No time should be lost.

For the Examiner.

A SOUL.—ITS VALUE.

BY H. L. H.

As we are informed that he that converteth a sinner shall save a soul from death, and as the question has been propounded by the Great Preacher "What is a man profited if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" it may be proper to occupy ourselves a little with contemplating its value.

By the term *soul*, here, we are to understand a *human being;* for a parallel passage represents the gainer of the whole world, as "loosing *himself* or becoming a cast away."

This question of the Saviour, in itself, would be sufficient to awaken our attention to a consideration of the value of man—as he seems to throw him singly into the scale, and weigh him against the world—certainly he must be of immense and incalculable value.

We sometimes attach value to an article on account of its origin. And if the lovers of the beautiful would spare no wealth to obtain a block of marble chisseled by the hand of a Praxiteles, or a picture drawn by the pencil of an Angelo, what must be the value of the living specimen of Jehovah's handiwork? What must be the price of that clay that has been moulded in beauty by the hands of Elohim, and enlivened by the breath of his lips?

Or, if we estimate the value of a substance by the associations that it recalls, if we value some battered and mutilated statue because it presents not only the glory of Grecian art, but also the image of a Grecian Hero, and the story of his noble deeds,—then how highly shall man be valued—since he furnishes us with our nearest and most perfect type of Him, in whose image he was created, and also appears to us as a rich though ruined relic of the golden age that has long since passed away?

But this is an age when men are busy enquiring after the profit, the practical value, and utility of things. And in this point of view, if we value the mechanism that in its operations transcends the wildest fancy of days gone by,—if we prize the master products of human ingenuity,—if we contemplate with astonishment and admiration the fruits of human intellect, wherewith shall we value the being that has within him not only the elements of these magnificent productions, but also the germs and seeds of *other* and *mightier* ones, that are yet unborn?

We value a seed because it may with careful culture expand and display a gorgeous flower, or spring upward and become a stately tree. We value a helpless child because he is the father of the man, and within that infantile mind are undeveloped powers that will grow with its growth, and strengthen with its strength, until earth shall tremble with fear, or smile with delight at the mention of his name. And if we thus value these things, how shall we value man, the noblest work of God, who, if planted in a nobler soil, and beneath a kindlier sky, and endowed with continuance there, might and would, in his expansion, as far transcend his present littleness as the tree in the branches of which all the fowls of the heaven do lodge, exceeds "the mustard seed," "which is the smallest among the seeds."

Not the least valuable property of man is his capacity for enjoyment. If his ice-like heart was warmed by no kindly glow,—if he was void of emotion, as the machinery that *he* produces—if joy never could cause his heart to beat higher, and his eye to beam with an unwonted brightness, then his value would well nigh be gone. Who would desire to preserve a race unfeeling as the stones? Who would weep to see the waters of oblivion close for ever above a generation that could never be happy?

But man is not so. O, there are even in this world, days of joy that would repay long years of toil. There are hours into which the bliss of a life-time seems to be crowded, and which make the weary son of sorrow forget his toils and repent of his murmurings, and say, "It is good for me that I have lived upon the earth." But these mountain tops with their sun-gleams are rare, and the intervening valleys with their gloom are deep and dreary. But there is another world, where the gladness of an earthly life may be comprised in the period of a single hour—where all the melody of earth shall be forgotten in one glorious burst of music from "harpers harping with their harps"—where all the grand and thrilling anthems of this world shall lose their harmony in that one song of "Salvation to our God." And man may be there! Man who takes so much delight in earthly joy, may share that which shall be perfect and unending. Man who wears out his life in the pursuit of a few evanescent pleasures, may share that fullness of joy, and possess those pleasures for evermore.

Yes: *for ever*, for man may be brought up from the dust of death—his weakness may become power—his dishonor may become glory—and that which was natural and dying in its constitution, may become spiritual and immortal by the will and power of God. And does not *this* render his value incalculable? The proudest works of man must pass away and moulder down. History shows us this. But while of the Temple of Jerusalem, with its magnificence, only a few pilgrim-kissed stones remain; while the Parthenon, the brightest gem of earth's broad zone, is but a heap of ruins; while the Palaces of the Cæsars has become a rope-walk—the Roman Forum, a cow-market—and the Tarpeian rock a cabbage garden,—while even the Pyramids themselves are all hastening to decay—while earth and all its glory rolls on to dissolution and *desolation;* while the works that are in it, however costly or enduring, must kindle the fires of the burning day, man may survive them all, and though in the cycles of eternity, star after star may disappear from view, yet shall the saint of God live onward. And is he of no value?

Let us look from another point of view. Go, mourner, go and gather to thyself all the wealth of many lands. Enter the caverns of the deep and bring up the riches of sunken argosies, ransack the bowels of the earth—enter the coffers of the rich and the covetous—traverse the broad world and return and bring its gold and silver and heap it in one vast and glittering pile. Go again and bring "each gem that glows amid earth's treasures of darkness," bring the sapphire and the emerald, the ruby and the crystal, the diamond and the onyx, bring up each pearl that lies hidden beneath the ocean wave, and pluck each brilliant that sparkles in the coronet of royalty—bring all these, and lay them with all the broidered robes and costly apparel, with all the fragrant perfumes and precious spices of eastern lands,—by the loved one's grave, and thus see if you can buy back *a single one* from the embrace of death. Yea, go and bring every gem that sparkles in the foundations of the City of God—bring every treasure that is there displayed, and bribe the grim king of terrors to let thy loved one go. And there, while the gates of the grave are yet unclosed, and while no answer comes from the guardian of those gloomy realms, *learn the value of a soul!*

Nay, we must go farther to learn it. We must pass by the treasures of earth as of no account—we must leave behind us the precious wisdom of the sages of olden time—we need not bring the prayers of the good, they will not avail, even the tear of penitence, so precious in the sight of God, is worthless here. We must forget all these and yet enquire the value of a soul. We must traverse every land, and survey every product of God's creative energy, and having sought throughout the universe, we must come back, and stooping down beside the cross of Calvary, we must grope amid the "darkness" that is "throughout all the land," until the returning light reveals to us the Saviour *dead*, and the earth crimsoned with his trickling blood. Here shall we find the value of a soul, and here standing beneath the shadow of the cross we will read—"Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot."

Here is the long-sought price—the equivalent of the soul. No wonder that the Apostle exhorted his brethren to care for the flock of God, since he had bought them with his own blood. This is the price—the blood of the Son of God for the soul—the man.

And now need I say one word to influence any to engage in the work of saving mankind? This soul once lost is lost forever. This soul must be saved "from *death*," or it must "*die*." It must live onward while eternity shall roll its ample cycles, or it must be "punished with everlasting destruction," and "be as though it had not been." These are the utterances of inspiration, the oracles of eternal truth. And that "*soul*" is *yourself*, or your *brethren*, your *sister*, your *wife*, your *husband*, or your *neighbor*.

Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him, *let him know*, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall SAVE A SOUL FROM DEATH, and shall hide a multitude of sins.

Plymouth, Mass., Feb., 1853.

———o———

CALLS.—Bros. Wilkinson and Brown, at Danville, N. Y., are informed that it is impossible for me to visit them at the time they speak of, and I fear not for some months to come. I am sorry also to say to Bros. Pickard and Cherry, in central Ohio, that I see no possible way to visit them at present. Never did it seem as if there *must* be men of God sent out into the work as at this moment. *Who will go?* and *who will help to sustain them?* All communications on the subject may be addressed to me, *New-York*.

GEO. STORRS.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, APRIL, 1853.

VISIT TO BOSTON.—Since our last issue, we have spent eight days in the City of Boston, and preached there ten times. The meeting was well got up by Brs. Geo. T. Adams, P. Dickinson, and others. We had large and attentive audiences in their new and commodious Hall. Many came in from surrounding towns, and the calls were pressing to visit various places in that quarter. We think the truth of Life only through Christ our *Life-Giver*, was greatly promoted in that vicinity; and our brethren saw the good effects of giving proper notices and scattering *hand bills;* which was done in the public houses, Sabbath mornings. By this means strangers, from distant places, were induced to come out; and a number from far-off took works on the subject. One gentleman from *Kentucky* became a subscriber for the Examiner. "Spirit-Rappers" are to work in Boston as elsewhere. Nothing kills them like the truth that dead men "know not anything," and that there is Life only through Christ by a literal resurrection from the dead.

We were kindly and happily entertained by Bro. Adams and his beloved wife, where we felt much at home. May the Lord reward them.

Bro. J. S. White preached there, we suppose, the two Sabbaths following our visit, and we have no doubt he watered the seed sown and scattered an abundance more in that field which seemed to offer more encouragement for cultivation than we ever witnessed in Boston before.

———o———

"THE FRENCH EMPIRE."—Our opinion is unchanged on that subject. Nothing has appeared to weaken our conviction of the general correctness of it: but we have not the space, time, nor *inclination* to enter into controversy any further about the matter. Unless future *events* shall show us incorrect we are sure none can show the contrary. Here we leave the matter till further developments in history shall settle clearly where the truth is.

———o———

DISHONESTY.—When an association, or individuals publish sentiments which the author has *publicly renounced*—and give no notice of the renunciation—all men, who have knowledge of the facts must pronounce it an act of dishonesty. Such an act "The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald" has been guilty of, in publishing a discourse of ours on "*The Return of the Jews*," delivered in 1843—ten years ago—and which we acknowledged in 1845, was incorrect, so far as it excluded the return of the *literal* seed of Jacob: and also protested against any one thereafter publishing it as *our views:* yet these sticklers for the observance of the "Seventh Day Sabbath"—as a part of the law from Sinai—have violated "*the whole law*" in *bearing* "*false witness*" against us, by publishing that discourse as ours—"BY GEORGE STORRS"—without one hint that it is not now, and has not been approved by us for *eight* years past. If these persons wish us to think they are *honest* in their contention for the observance of the Seventh Day Sabbath, let them *confess* the wrong they have done in this matter, and do works suitable for repentance.

———o———

RESURRECTION OF THE WICKED—OPINION OF THE JEWS.—"The Jews believed that the wicked should have no resurrection: and that the principle that led to the resurrection of the body in the righteous, was the indwelling Spirit of God. This is positively asserted in the *Shir Hashirim Rabbi.* See *Schoetgen*"—*Dr. Adam Clarke's Commentary,* on John 6: 39.

"It was an opinion of the Jews themselves, that their fathers who perished in the wilderness, should never have resurrection."—*Dr. Clarke on John* 6: 49.

———o———

CHRISTIANITY IN THE THIRD CENTURY.—"God-like life and a holy life—these were inseparable notions in the Christian mind; both were comprehended in the single notion of *aphtharsia*—incorruption. Now the Logos was regarded as the source of this life; Christ as the appearance of the Logos in humanity—as the Mediator of this higher life." NEANDER: *Church History,* vol. 2, p. 388. Bohn's Ed.

———o———

FROM DR. LEES, ENGLAND.

Kent House, Meanwood near Leeds,
Feb. 20, 1853.

MY DEAR MR. STORRS:—Though it is long since you heard from me, you are not forgotten, nor the good cause you advocate, in which I am as much interested as ever. But illness last year, and much travel and literary occupation since, have prevented me *writing* anything thereupon. Some day (when I have finished publishing my WORKS) I propose writing a long paper for your *Examiner*, on a subject that wants a fuller and more exhaustive treatment than it has yet received—*the doctrine of the Future Life as taught in the Targums and Rabbinical writings.*

Our friend, Panton Ham, has commenced a new periodical (published by Whitfield, London,) called the *Christian Examiner:* Four Nos. of which are

out—devoted very much to the same object as the *Bible Examiner.*

I find *the Truth* making way amongst various sections of the Church. "Mr. Marshall Hall Higginbottom, Surgeon, of *Nottingham,*" the other day enquired of me about the doctrine, and ordered a set of the *Truth-Seeker* on account of that work containing a discussion of the subject. I advised him to get Mr. Ham's books and periodicals.

An intelligent lady amongst "*the Friends,*" also, got another set for the same reason; and a good number of the Episcopal Clergy are inclining in that direction. Dr. *Ackworth*, of the Horton Baptist College, in a debate with Mr. *Holyoake*, the leader of the English non-theists (*Secularists*, as they prefer to be called,) was sadly nonplussed on this very point—and, allowing eternal *torment* to be a fact in the universe, said it was surrounded with *inexplicable difficulties!* He was for postponing the solution—but his opponent acutely observed, that revelation ought to *remove* natural difficulties rather than add *greater ones of its own.* The sceptic, it is clear, CANNOT be met by the pseudo-orthodox.

With kindest regards, Yours, very truly,

FRED. RICH'D LEES.

DR. LEES will accept our thanks for the foregoing short note, and the information it contains. We hope he may favor us soon with the promised article from the Targums and Rabbinical writings. We want all the light we can get on this subject.

—o—

TRUTH ONWARD.—We take the following from the Methodist Quarterly Review of January last. It is found in an article on the "*Incompetence of Reason in matters of Religion*, by *Professor H. M. Johnson*, Dickinson College." We wonder if our opponents will not use one another up. Surely Prof. Johnson *uses up* such reasoning as that of Luther Lee, and Eld. Stearns. Here is the extract; let it be pondered well.

"Descending from Deity to man, we notice his efforts to prove his own immortality. It has been common to establish, by a series of negative conclusions, that soul or spirit is not subject to the laws of matter, and then from immateriality to conclude immortality, or imperishability. But why such an inference? Is it that we see matter constantly perishing, and, from the unlikeness of spirit in other respects, we infer dissimilitude in this also? Such deduction were even then illogical; but, on the other hand, matter does not perish obviously; and, we suppose, cannot, except by the hand of the Omnipotent. The power which created, could doubtless uncreate; and if this be true, no reason can be given why spirit is not, equally with matter, obnoxious to such a fate. It is only in its organic forms, and the principle of physical life, that matter seems to lack permanence and durability—mere conditions of matter, and conditions in which, if approximation could be said at all, it approaches nearest the nature of spirit.

"But this argument is generally abandoned now by those at all conversant with the subject, and that on which reliance is had, casts itself into this form:—It is asserted that the soul can perish in but one of three ways, to wit: either by *dissolution*, by *privation*, or by *annihilation.* Granted; and what next? First:—That which is without parts cannot be dissolved. The soul is simple and uncompounded; therefore, it cannot perish by dissolution. So we believe; but not by virtue of this syllogism. To say nothing of the fallacy lurking in the ambiguous forms of the major term, the second premiss here assumes to define the nature of spirit, whereas it is only shown that we cannot define it. Water and air were believed to be simple and uncompounded elements. Platinum and hydrogen are still believed to be so. Some substances which are reckoned such now, are strongly suspected to be compound. Of spirit we can only affirm, in this regard, that it cannot be subjected to analysis, and, for aught we know, may be the most simple or the most complex thing created.

"But, secondly, What can be said of *privation?* By this term our metaphysicians seem to understand, the soul's ceasing to exist, or gradually relinquishing life, "by the tendencies of its own nature." And they argue that, if its natural tendency be to death, it will, by virtue of this property, at some period, cease to exist; if its tendency be to life, it will live forever. And that it now exists, they claim as sufficient evidence that its natural tendency is to existence. What is this, but stark atheism?—a making of certain properties necessarily inherent in the soul? If God created the soul, it was for him to give it its conditions of existence; and for aught that human reason can tell, it were as easy for him to make the condition of the soul's existence the life of the body, as to make the presence of light the condition of colors.

"The third point—that the Almighty *can* annihilate the soul—may not be questioned; and whether he *will*, must so obviously be matter of revelation, that philosophy even must consent to resign us to that source of instruction."

—o—

THE WINE QUESTION *Considered in an entirely novel point of view, with* ILLUSTRATIONS (philosophical and critical,) *on the* PRINCIPAL PASSAGES OF THE BIBLE *connected with the subject:* Appendix to Works of Dr. Lees," England.

We have received a copy of this work from the Author, but have not had time to *examine* it. From a hasty glance over it we should think it might be very instructive and useful, containing a large amount of information calculated to interest those desirous to investigate the subject. It most likely will be reprinted in this country: at least, we hope it may be.

—o—

CORRECTION.—For "*full* of ruth," read *scant* of ruth, in Feb. Examiner, p. 19, line 30 from bottom in the version from "Jean Paul," by Dr. Lees.

BRO. JONATHAN WILSON.—This aged brother, (now about 75,) it seems has not lost his missionary spirit; as he writes us, he is about starting on a tour to Indiana. We are glad the Lord has blessed him with strength to continue in the work. Strong in the Lord, and in the faith of Life *only* through Christ, we doubt not he will prove a blessing wherever he may go. We hope the friends in the West will receive him with open hearts and help him on his way after a Godly sort. May the Lord make him a great blessing among you.

—o—

"BIBLE VS. TRADITION."

We give the following from that part of the work which consists of an examination of the Hebrew term *Sheol*, and the Greek word *Hades*. To feel the full force of it, it is necessary to read the whole chapter on the subject: but this extract may create a desire to see the whole work.

Sheol is the only word that is translated *hell* in the O. T., and as we shall see, it always means the state of death, the grave, and corruption; and never can mean a place of conscious torment. The learned George Campbell observes, that the word *sheol* in the O T. means no more than *kever*, the *grave*. or sepulchre, excepting that it has a more general sense. *Kever*, we have seen, is never translated *hell*.

To show more conspicuously the glaring absurdity of considering the Hebrew *sheol*, as a *burning* hell for the torment of the wicked, we adduce *sheol* as being the name of the first king of Israel. In later times this name has been differently pointed. thereby making a little difference in the sound of the letters, without altering in the least degree their meaning, and is written *Saul*. See the meaning of Saul in Cruden's Concordance, p. 716. This caps the climax. It will be recollected that the chief apostle of the Gentiles, being a Hebrew of the Hebrews, was named *Saul*. But how would it shock a Christian congregation to hear a child. at baptism, named *Hell!* Yet when Hebrew children were brought before the Lord, at circumcision, many of their names were called *Sheol*, or *Saul!* And as the Hebrews considered this an appropriate name in the days of the apostles, it is impossible to believe that they ever associated with it the idea of the comparatively modern invented and 'orthodox' HELL!!

Where the word hell is found in the common version, *grave* is often found in the margin, and the reverse; showing that the translators regarded *either* of these two words as a suitable representative for the word *sheol;* yet have they availed themselves of every opportunity to insert the word *hell*, where it would favor the popular tradition. We give a few instances where the margin and the text differ. Ps. 55: 15, "Let death seize upon them, and let them go down quickly into (*sheol*) hell." *Margin*, the *grave*. The meaning of both clauses is similar: Let them die. That his enemies should be horribly tormented for ever, was a more suitable desire for Moloch than for David. Ps. 86: 13, "Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest (*sheol*) hell." Margin, *grave*. Assemblies of violent men had sought after the soul of David, the life and being of David; but God had delivered his soul, himself, from the 'lowest *sheol*,' from the most terrible and cruel death. Jonah 2: 2, "Out of the belly of (*sheol*) hell cried I, and thou heardest my voice." Margin, *grave*. *Sheol* here, a figure of death. Isa. 14: 9, "(*Sheol*) hell from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming." Margin, *grave*. Verse 11, "Thy pomp is brought down to the (*sheol*) *grave*." V. 15, "Yet thou shalt be brought down to (*sheol*) hell, to the sides of the (*bour*) pit." V. 18, "All the kings of the nations, even all of them, lie in glory, every one in his own house," (or separate sepulchre). V. 19, "But thou are cast out of thy (*kever*) *grave*. like an abominable branch, and as the raiment of those that are slain, thrust through with the sword, and go down to the stones of the (*bour*) pit, as a carcass trodden under feet. Thou shalt not be joined with them in (*kevooroh*, allied to *kever*) burial, because thou hast destroyed thy land, and slain thy people: the seed of evil doers shall never be renowned." If 'going into *sheol*' and 'going into the grave' are identical and synonymous expressions in verses 11 and 15. and are made to agree with *house* or *sepulchre*, and *kever*, and *bour* the *grave*, and *pit*, v. 18 and 19; then certainly *sheol* in v. 11 means the same, and all imply a *state of death*. And going into *sheol*, and going into a grave cut out of the sides of the pit, equally expresses only a state of death. Mark particularly the reading of v. 11, "Thy pomp is brought down to *sheol*, and the noise of thy viols: the worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee." But this *sheol* was in 'the sides of the pit.' In Ezek 32: 23, *kever*, the grave, is likewise in the 'sides of the pit.' Whose (*kevoreem*, plural of *kever*.) *graves*, are set in the sides of the (*bour*) pit." From this we likewise prove, that *kever*, the *grave*, and *pit*, and *prison*, all imply the same thing, and that *sheol*, hell, if you please, implies no more, only as being a more general expression.

In nearly all the thirty-three places where *sheol* is rendered *grave* and *pit*, it would be extremely absurd to call *sheol hell*. Nevertheless we will call *sheol* hell—the very orthodox 'hell where the wicked are tormented for ever'—seeing ye will have it so, just for a little while, only that you may the better perceive the absurdity. Gen. 37: 35, Jacob said, "For I will go down into (*sheol*) hell, unto my son mourning." Jacob supposed that Joseph was torn to pieces, yet in *sheol*. Did Jacob believe that his son Joseph was in *hell*, and that he would soon follow? Remember we are justified in calling *sheol hell* here, if the translators are in thirty-one other places. Gen. 42: 28, Jacob again said, "Then shall ye bring down my grey hairs with sorrow to (*sheol*) hell." The same words occur in Ch. 44: 29, 31. Did the sons of Jacob think that they would bring down their father with his grey hairs to *hell* to meet there his son Joseph? 1 Kings 2: 6, 9, "Let not his hoar head go down to (*sheol*) hell in peace....But his *hoar head* bring thou down to (*sheol*) hell with blood." David gave these directions to Solomon concerning Joab and Shemei: Did David believe that the hoar heads of these two would go in "peace" into a *hell of torments*, if not slain by violence? He says not a word where their

"immortal ghosts" were to go. Ps. 88: 3, The Psalmist said, "My soul is full of troubles; and my life draweth nigh unto (*sheol*) hell." Ps. 89: 48, "What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of (*sheol*) hell?" If you insist that *sheol* means hell, then no man can save his soul from hell. Ecc. 9: 10, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in hell, (*sheol,*) whither thou goest." If *sheol* means *hell*, then *all* go to *hell*; but there is no knowledge there, so the damned "know not anything;" and, of course, know no suffering; and so the *hell* of the *Bible*, is *not* the *theological hell*. Isa. 38: 10, "I shall go to the gates of (be under the power of) hell, (*sheol*). I am deprived of the residue of my years." Well might the pious Hezekiah have prayed that he might not die, if he had thought he would go to a *hell of torments*; but no, he thought it would terminate his years, his existence, till the resurrection. Ps. 30: 3, "O Lord, thou hast brought up my soul from hell, (*sheol*)." Hosea 13: 14, "I will ransom them from the power of hell, (*sheol*); I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O hell, (*sheol,*) I will be thy destruction." But if God destroys hell, the damned must either escape or be destroyed with it. But then, How can the endless misery doctrine be established? Ps. 49: 12, "Nevertheless man being in honor abideth not: he is like the beasts that perish. 14 v, *Like sheep* they are laid in hell, (*sheol*); death shall feed on them; and the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning (of the resurrection,) and their beauty shall consume in hell, (*sheol,*) from their dwelling. But God will redeem my soul from the power of hell, (*sheol*): for he shall receive me." The Psalmist, and the wicked, and sheep, *go together* to hell (*sheol*): but God will ultimately redeem the Psalmist therefrom. But what have sheep done that they, poor things, should be tormented for ever? But suppose *sheol* should mean the state of death, of unconsciousness and corruption, then how natural and easy to comprehend the meaning of all these quotations. Ps. 6: 4, "Return, O Lord, deliver my soul: Oh save me for thy mercies' sake. For in death, there is no remembrance of thee: in hell, (*sheol,*) who shall give thee thanks?" Here *death* and *sheol* are made interchangable and synonymous, and constitute a state in which there is no memory nor giving of thanks. Now, if *sheol* means *hell* in thirty-one other places, then *sheol* means *hell* here, for it cannot bear the opposite meaning of a place of conscious torment for the wicked; a place of conscious enjoyment for the righteous; and likewise an opposite meaning of a place, the grave, where the dead, corrupt in unconscious silence!! Who will believe such absurdities? As the translators, biased by their pagan traditions, believed in the immortality, and in the separate conscious existence of the soul, so they must necessarily provide a place for their reception: hence the fables that the wicked dead are now tormented in hell, and the righteous dead are now in a state of glorification in heaven, or paradise, or somewhere else. It is a pity they could not find a more accommodating word that could be more effectually twisted into accordance with their traditions, than this same word *sheol!!*

MORE FABLES.

"The Creator has given us these bodies to be our habitation—a dwelling adapted to our highest comfort and welfare. Our individual identity does not consist in the body. The body is not the man. The man is really an invisible being; and his body is the house in which he lives. The eye is no part of man; it is only the window of the house through which he looks out upon the world. The ear is no part of man; it is only the earthly medium through which sound is conveyed to the dweller within.—When the house decays, he will live elsewhere. It is now a habitation fitted up by the Creator, of which he should be a faithful steward and tenant, till called hence to give account. But if he wantonly destroy that dwelling, suddenly or gradually, by setting it on fire, to enjoy the splendor of the flames, or the grandeur of the lighted clouds of smoke, or by gradually digging away the foundation on which the vital structure is based, he stands charged with the crime of suicide before heaven, and must answer to it in the day of judgment."

Br. Storrs—The foregoing is extracted from a physiological work containing much useful information, and compiled with more than ordinary ability. I was struck with the inconsistency and falsity of this position, and exclaimed in the language of holy writ—"*Great* men are not always *wise*." How strange, surpassingly strange, that such a dogma is so universally believed, even by those of superior talent and learning; and who, upon other points, are capable of sound reasoning and discernment! Alas! "That old serpent" has wound his coils around the human mind, and fastened them so strongly, that it seems almost impossible they should ever be unloosed. The main point of his deception is to lead men to believe that they *are something more than what they really are*—and thus cause them to be "lifted up with pride," and fall into the same "condemnation," into which he has fallen. Herein lay the force of the temptation in Eden. "Ye are something more that human beings," said this great deceiver; "even immortal—and when ye have tasted the forbidden fruit your eyes will be opened to discern your exalted state—ah, ye shall be as gods—or the Elohim—angels." Such was his assertion; and though nearly six thousand years have elapsed, he is still in the same subtle way proclaiming it, and constantly gaining victims to the deception.

There is one point in the extract to which I wished particularly to draw attention. It is this—That *if man destroys in any way the dwelling or habitation wherein the part constituting his identity lives, he stands charged with the crime of suicide before heaven*, and must accordingly give account. Now let us see if this is logical. What is the crime of suicide? It is self-murder, or the act of destroying one's *self*. But the author has stated, in so many words, that "*The body is not the man*," but that "the man is an invisible being within." Then, of course, the body is not *himself*, and if he merely destroys the habitation *containing himself*, how can it be *suicide*? That invisible part, constituting the *man*, according to the same philosophy, *cannot* be destroyed. It is immortal—imperishable. I unhesitatingly affirm then—that in accordance with this mode of reasoning, *No man can kill himself:*

That THE CRIME OF SUICIDE NEVER HAS BEEN, AND NEVER CAN BE COMMITTED—and THEREFORE SHOULD BE BLOTTED OUT OF THE CATALOGUE.

Now I leave it to the intelligent mind to say whether this is not the more logical deduction from such premises. Surely, all will assent to it. But reason, common sense, and the Bible have all given way before this false philosophy; and yet the great mass see not its absurdity.

Strange, indeed, that the Bible makes the mere *dwelling* of man of so much importance. and regards so little the "invisible man" himself! Even the gospel hope is based wholly upon the resurrection of this "habitation"! The apostles devoted their entire energies to the preaching of "Jesus and the resurrection;" while Paul expressly declared that his great effort, as regarded himself, was to "attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Yes—he desired to have his "habitation" quickened by the Spirit of God, and live eternally. Why, O why, beloved apostle, didst thou not say something about the invisible man? Why so anxious about the mere covering, if the real man were to live, at all events. Would not that individual be counted a fool, who, possessing a gem of invaluable treasure, should lavish all his praise and delight upon the mere box containing it? Away with such utter perversion of just reasoning, sound philosophy, and the word of God, as that we have been considering. Truth is ever in harmony with the dictates of Reason; and God, the mighty author of Truth, hath never enjoined upon our faith gross absurdities: *No, never.*

This is indeed a great subject, and much more might be said even upon this feature of it. The Lord be praised that truth is finding its way into some minds, and making progress. May these few hints aid in a measure the blessed cause.

A. C. JUDSON.

Rochester, N. Y., Jan. 25, 1853.

A SOLEMN CAUTION.

"BEWARE OF PHILOSOPHY AND VAIN DECEIT."

1 Tim. 6: 12, 16, 19-21. "Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold of eternal life—Lord of lords: who *only* hath immortality—*avoiding* profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of *science, falsely* so called, which some professing have erred concerning the faith—of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus; who concerning *the truth* have erred, saying that the *resurrection is past* already, and overthrew the faith of some." 2 Tim. 2: 17, 18.

We learn from this that eternal life, or immortality, is something to be fought for, and to be laid hold upon as a boon, that by nature we have not; and we positively learn by the connection that the Lord *only* hath *immortality:* certainly then man hath it not. Furthermore, we are to *avoid false science*, or heathen philosophy, which taught the immortality of the soul, which is not a truth, but an error; for it saith the resurrection is past when men die, and overthrew the faith of some in that day; and it is fast doing the same in this day and age of the world.

Here allow me to make some historical extracts concerning this doctrine then and now; and compare them with the Scriptures; for this is our only sure word of prophecy and guide.

"Chaldean and Indian magi have been the first who asserted the immortality of the soul."—*Pausanias.*

"It is indeed known that the *immortality* of the soul was not known to the Jews, but by the commerce which they had with the Assyrians during the time of their captivity."—*Larcher.—Herodotus*, page 111.

Socrates asserts that the soul is immortal—it must receive eternal happiness or misery—and that "they live without their bodies through all eternity."—*Rollin's History.*

Josephus to the Greeks,—"You believe that the soul is created and yet is made immortal by God according to the doctrine of Plato."

Dr. Mosheim, in his Church History, puts it down—"What was worst of all, several tenets of a chimerical philosophy were imprudently incorporated into the Christian system. Its first promoters argued from that known doctrine of the Platonic school, which was also adopted by Origin and his disciples, that the Divine nature was diffused thro' all human souls."

Mosheim also states, in his 2d vol., p. 290—That the quakes "to be nothing more than a certain modification of that famous Mystic Theology, which arose so early as the second century, was fostered and embellished by the luxuriant fancy of Origin." In addition to this we have Swedenborgians, Universalism, and last of all, A. J. Davis' Revelations, and the rapping and writing mediums; all against the resurrection of the dead; and they assert that the immortal soul is all that ever will be resurrected; and that was never dead! Job asks the question (14: 14,) "If a man die shall he live again?" And says, "Though worms destroy this body yet in my flesh shall I see God." 19: 26. "The Lord is risen indeed;" Luke 24: 34. "*Many bodies* of the saints which slept arose;" Mat. 27: 52. "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept;" 1 Cor. 15: 20. "How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? Verse 35. "Who shall change our *vile* body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body;" Phil. 3: 21; Rom. 8: 11.

All this appears too plain to need a word of comment. As sure as Christ rose with his body from the tomb so sure must our bodies be raised. Now the only question is who shall we believe, the contradictory spiritualizer or the Scriptures of the truth?

I have been reading a pamphlet called "Elements of Spiritual Philosophy;" purporting to have been "written by spirits of the sixth circle," (at Springfield, Mass). On page 30, it is said—"In the light of this truth, it is easy to explain the cause and philosophy of those *miraculous* occurrences which took place in the days of Moses, Jesus, and the Apostles—and let the truth be profoundly realized that it has been their (spirit) power, their wisdom, and theirs alone, which have produced the *miracles* of the past and present."

Contrary to the Bible; see Mat. 12: 28—"But if I cast out devils by the *Spirit of God*," &c. Jesus did not do his miracles by the aid of departed immortal spirits, as this plainly proves. John 11: 41, Jesus called on his Father to raise Lazarus.

This was a miracle. Did departed spirits raise him? We think not. Acts 3: 6, "In the name of *Jesus Christ* of Nazareth rise up and walk," (4: 10) "By *him* doth this man stand here before you whole." The apostles do not understand it was through departed spirits that this miracle was done. Acts 19: 11, "And God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul." But read 13 to 16 verses, and see what work spirits made in trying to imitate the power of God.

In page 56 it is said, "There are *no spirits* which are intrinsically evil in their nature. Their source is" (made to be) "*the very breath of Deity.*"

Acts 19: 15, "And the *evil spirit* answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?" There is something about this that does not seem right.

Page 74, "They (angels) have brought *life* and *immortality* to light."

2 Tim. 1: 10, "Christ hath brought *life* and *immortality* to light through the gospel."

I am afraid that these "spirits of the sixth circle" are claiming too much.

Isa. 8: 19–20; "And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits—should not a people seek unto their God? for the living (God) (than) to the dead?" (that know not anything). "To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them;" (familiar spirits; wizards, *their mediums.*) The writing mediums are in many parts of Michigan, and are working their wonders. Time only can tell what will be the final result. One thing is very strange; if it be from a good source, why do they make use of wicked, profane, ignorant men, that know nothing of the Bible? Such persons are the first to believe it: or some ignorant bigotted church member.

Chelsea, Mich. J. B. FRISBIE.

STATE OF THE DEAD.

BR. STORRS:—As there has been so much said on this subject, I will be very brief, and only notice one text now, which has been supposed to teach the conscious state. Rev. 6: 9, 10—The souls under the altar. These were "the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held." They were righteous. Then they never made such a prayer or cry as is represented in the 10th verse; and there must be some general misunderstanding of the text. We are commanded to love our enemies, and to pray for them that despitefully use us; to bless them that curse us, do good to them that hate us, &c. And Christ left us the glorious example as well as the precept. He died interceding with the Father to forgive his murderers, even amidst their insults. How then could these righteous dead ones, under the altar, cry for the vengeance of God to overtake their enemies, in such glaring contradiction to the teaching of the Holy Spirit? They certainly could not; and the text must not so be understood as to make void the precepts and example of our blessed Lord and Master.

How then shall we understand the text? The souls under the altar, or as is elsewhere often translated, the persons of them that were slain, &c. Now there is no figure of speech more common than the one that makes inanimate objects speak, and often act; as the trees clapped their hands, the hills skipped like lambs; the blood of Abel cried to God for vengeance. That will do; for vengeance is mine, saith the Lord, and I will repay. But Abel himself, as a righteous man, could not cry to God for vengeance on his brother; but if conscious he should pray to God to forgive him his foul murder. But his *blood*, or to take off the figure, the circumstance of his murder, would cry to God for vengeance on his brother, the murderer. So of the individuals seen by John in vision; being slain for the testimony they bore, was a circumstance that cried with a loud voice to God for vengeance; yet there is no better evidence that they were alive after they were dead, than there is that the blood of Abel was alive and had a voice and spoke after Abel was dead; or that the blood of Christ was alive and had a voice, because it is said to speak better things than the blood of Abel; or that the grave-stones are alive and have a voice, because we say they speak the mortality of man. Now, since John wrote there have been millions slain for the testimony which they bore. No wonder that John, foreseeing it, should, by the usual figure of speech, say they cried with a loud voice; how long ere their blood would be avenged. Z. CAMPBELL.

Englishtown Academy, N. J., Feb. 7, 1853.

FROM ELD. JACOB BLAIN.

Buffalo, N. Y., March 25, 1853.

BR. STORRS:—The Washington Street Baptist Church, of this city, having withdrawn fellowship from me, for holding and preaching the Bible instead of their creed—that is for holding that the "wages of sin is *death*," and not *endless misery*—I sent their proceedings to the first Baptist Church in Maidstone, England, with the request to become a member of their body, and have received an answer, the conclusion of which is as follows:—

"We do hereby cordially agree and consent to our brother's (Elder Blain's) request, and authorize him to consider and declare himself a member of this church: and we wish him every blessing from the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Signed, H. H. DOBNEY, *Pastor.*"

Maidstone, Sept., 1852.

(Will the *Harbinger* and *Watchman* please copy?

J. BLAIN.)

As the Examiner is sent to the above-named church, permit me to say to them—I feel grateful for their kind reception, and commend them for the *bold stand* they are taking for the *truth*,—also to express my love and gratitude to their beloved pastor for the light and joy, myself, and thousands of others have received from his pen. Dear Br. Dobney, may we not hope for more light from you? and yet see you in America? Thousands of hearts which have been emancipated from the gloomy thoughts of eternal woe and sin, in our Father's universe, would greet you with joy—new ears would be opened, and truth advanced. Lovers of tradition, ease, and popularity, will of course strive to stifle reform; and one of their devices, with us, is, the cry of "*ultraism*"—"*one idea*," &c; but was a reform ever effected without sacrifices, and *some*

dedicating themselves like Clarkson and Wilberfore, to the work? To the glorious reform of "*life and death*," I have dedicated myself for life. I have only time to add, that I know of five Baptist churches in the States which receive and approbate our views; and I can but hope they will soon be blessed with light and moral courage to take the fearless and God-honoring stand your church has done—a church in which I am happy to have a standing.

JACOB BLAIN.

FROM ELD. C. M. RICHMOND.

Gowando, N. Y., March 18, 1853.

BRO. STORRS:—The following document I cut from the American Baptist Publication at Utica. It shows that the doctrine of *natural immortality* is deemed in danger of being swept away, in the "great West." Well, let them rally with their strong (?) arguments—truth can lose nothing by a thorough discussion. I am well persuaded that the West is a far more inviting field for presenting new and important Truth than the East

I was glad to see in the last Examiner, a move for raising a fund for the promotion of the truths we advocate. I do earnestly hope that men of wealth, who have become free from old error, will contribute liberally to this object.

I received a letter recently from a brother Marshall W. Leland, of Laporte, Ind. He has become established in the doctrine of Life only in Christ, and rewards at the judgment. He is a Baptist minister, but has not preached much for some time past. He says, "If I ever preach again, I must witness the Truth."

Bro. Leland says, "Eld. Chandler has been voted out of the church (Baptist,) but he has set up a meeting in a good hall, which, I think, will secure him a much larger congregation. Many of the brethren and sisters have embraced the above views," [i. e., the *Bible* doctrine of Life and Death."]

Your brother,

C. M. RICHMOND.

The following is the document spoken of:—

Turtleville, Feb. 18, 1853.

RESOLUTION

"Of the Dane Conference of Baptist Ministers, convened at Aztalan, Jefferson County, Wis.

"Whereas, Br. B F. Burr, pastor of the church at Turtleville, Wis., has read an Essay before us, on the subject of "The Immortality of the Soul," which we regard as a timely production, and well adapted under the Divine blessing, to stay the tide of infidelity which is now flooding the great West, therefore,

"*Resolved*, That we earnestly recommend its publication; and do hereby pledge ourselves to aid the worthy author in its circulation, and thus, so far as may be, secure him against pecuniary embarrassment from a compliance with his suggestion.

E. D. BOWEN, Committee."

"We earnestly recommend" our friends in that section to follow the said "*Essay*" with a flood of Ham's works and our Review of Stearns. Now is the time to scatter light on Life *only* through Christ.—ED. EX.

FROM FREDERICK WRIGHT.

Spencerville, Canada West.

BRO. STORRS:—The more I study the *nature* of, and the *matchless advantages* belonging to man's salvation; the more firmly am I convinced, that to attain to this salvation, even through the mighty aid of a Gracious Redeemer, it is all-important, nay *absolutely* necessary, that he, *Man*, have a *proper* and *just estimate* of what he *really is*—both by birth and nature. As long as we think ourselves of an immortal nature by birth—we cannot possibly cultivate a true and earnest desire to attain salvation through Jesus Christ alone. The belief in our natural immortality, creates a carelessness about commiting sin—an indifference towards the effect of God's vengeance, (if I may so express myself,) which is totally incompatible with that *Holy Fear*, and submissive Love, which form the sunlight of the Christian character. If we are indeed, *imperishable* creatures, and *cannot* die, it is palpably evident to any mind that is endowed with the slightest degree of *reflection*, or the smallest perception of *right* and *wrong*, that a God of INFINITE, unbounded, unending LOVE, would never punish with *eternal torture* or *misery*, any of His creatures, not to say His children, for the sins of a life-time. It is wholly irreconcilable with *any one or all His attributes* together, even in the faintest lights that Reason ever shed upon our benighted path.

This belief in innate immortality, I take to be the basis of all that hardness of heart, that keeps man from God, the true cause of that blindness which veils the plainest truths of the gospel in impenetrable darkness to the great mass of mankind. That those clouds of thick darkness are in a degree dispelled, and far and near dispelling, is to me an evident sign that we are rapidly approaching the grand finale of the world's history in its present state.

It must be a glorious sight to thee, and fill thy heart with songs of gratitude to God, as thou lookest over the once lonely battlefield of Truth, to see the numerous and stalwart warriors, now thronging to aid from every side, in the defence of God's *noblest*, *proudest*, and *most soul-invigorating* promise—

"That mortal man may become *immortal*, and shall be an heir with Christ by Faith in the Son of God."

Thank God! for the *Hope*. Bro. Storrs, thou and others will shortly test its truth. Go on in the name of Israel's God. The arm of Jehovah support thee in every trial, and the fullness of God's love in Christ Jesus be thy ultimate reward, is the fervent heart-felt prayer of thy unworthy pilgrim brother.

FREDERICK WRIGHT.

To hold the truth captive, is to retain God himself; is to rob those to whom he belongs as much as to us; is to intercept his progress and diffusion into the very hearts of men; is to take away bread from those who are dying of hunger. Every other denial may have its reason, may find its excuse; but there can be no reason, no excuse for withholding the truth. We are not bound to give bread to all men under all circumstances; but we owe to all men, and in all cases, the communication of the truth.—*Prof. Vinet.*

From Lucretia B. Lamb.

Heath, Mass.

Esteemed Brother in Christ:—I have long wished for an opportunity to write you an account of the way in which my Heavenly Father has led me to a reception of what I now understand to be his revealed truth; circumstances have hitherto prevented my doing so, although ten years have intervened since I have fully believed that Jesus is the true source of Immortality, and the wages of sin is death.

The excitement of the season of forty-three, which brought my dear brother [David W. White,] from Philadelphia, to warn us that our probation was fast hastening to a close, led me to examine my standing as a Christian, and my Bible to learn what was there revealed. I had long considered myself a Bible scholar, able to teach others; but I now discovered that I was ignorant, and resolved that with the Bible in my hands I would not be beholden to any one to tell me what was contained in it.—The question arose, with so many different explanations of the written word, How shall I know what it does teach? I came to the conclusion, after much anxiety, that the Spirit of God which indited the sacred page was the only adequate teacher to which I could refer. I would say here, that I was searching to find whether Second Advent Doctrine was a Bible truth or not, I had no idea of finding the end of the wicked death, or the sleep of the dead, contained in the same volume; those, I knew to be errors. I commenced my Bible—which was very familiar; so much so that I could repeat whole gospels—with looking to God for his Spirit that I might understand his word.—I went through with the whole Bible in the same way. I became fully established in the Second Advent Doctrine. The question often arose—while giving myself up to Divine teaching—why is the end of the wicked always called death, destruction, perish, &c? I then went over my Bible again in the same way, and became satisfied that these views were there taught, but found some difficulties—such as the parable of the rich man—the thief on the cross—the smoke of their torment, and the like. I wrote to my brother to get an explanation from you of these parts of Holy Writ. He sent me your Six Sermons, which was the first I ever read upon the subject. I had studiously avoided the pieces in the Examiner, fearing I should be led into an error. A perusal of those discourses cleared away all the difficulties in my mind; so much so that the subject appears wonderfully clear and interesting; and I can but wonder at my former blindness and ignorance. I was governed by the opinion of others, and supposed the way I had been instructed must be right, as my parents were very good people. I did not search the Bible with a prayerful spirit to know for myself what it did teach. My father became convinced that this was Bible truth. Before his death he told me he could not say aught against it. My mother and brother Joseph are firmly established in this truth, yet there are but few among us who do not consider it heresy. I have been told that it was a more pernicious doctrine than that taught by Tom Paine.

It has been my practice when thus denounced to refer my cause to God, that I might know whether I was such an instrument of evil; but the result has ever been a firmer conviction that it was truth. I never heard a sermon from the living preacher upon this subject, but I find the Examiner a rich treat, and hail its arrival with delight.

The discourses of Rev. J. Panton Ham are exceedingly clear and interesting; and it does seem as if any candid enquirers after truth could not fail to be convinced.

I am a poor widow—the mother of eight children—and have watched and taken care of a sick and helpless husband seven years. Last March he fell asleep. I trust in Jesus. The glorious doctrine of the Resurrection has been the most consoling theme for meditation in this bereavement. How sweet to think his life is hid with Christ in God, and that when Christ who is his life shall appear, he will also appear with him in glory: not a poor worn-out sufferer, but a triumphant conquerer. O, how worthy the aspiration of every intelligent being—how noble the purpose of those who strive to attain unto the resurrection of the dead. The sermons I hear are seldom seasoned with this cordial doctrine; or if brought to view, it is in such a way as renders it of no effect. Last Sabbath I heard a sermon from these excellent words, "I go to prepare a place for you, and if I go and prepare a place for you I will come again and receive you to myself, that where I am there ye may be also" The time of Christ's coming was at death, said the preacher; and the believer would hardly close his eyes upon these sublunary hills, before he would fix them upon the throne of God. The resurrection he never alluded to. I could not but think this was another gospel. He said many things that were very good, but I have to pick out and throw away much that I hear at the present day, and I do fear it will one day be found to be hay, wood, and stubble. It would give me much pleasure if the Providence of God should lead you this way, that I might have an interview, and hear from your lips the truth of the gospel. I think many would come together to hear, and good would be done; at least, I trust to meet you in the Kingdom of God. For this great object let us labor and pray, and we shall be truly conquerors through him who loved us, and died for us.

—o—

Selected.

To the Editor of Christian Examiner, [Eng.]

Manchester.

My Dear Sir,—Your favor, enclosing two periodicals and tract on the Lord's Supper, with enclosures, I duly received, and tender you my best thanks. My booksellers have also forwarded me the two numbers of the "Examiner" since I gave them the name of Tweedle. Another subscriber takes the latter copies off my hands. Mr. Moncrieff's sermon, "The Question of Questions," is an able production, and full of evangelical unction. I have read them (the numbers) through with great interest. One of our preachers dined with me on Sunday last. The topic of his morning's discourse was (strangely enough) the "Ordinance of the Lord's Supper,"—he took the liberal and anti-sacerdotal views of the question. My wife (who is more zealous in this way than myself) took the opportunity to lend your tract, and elicited from him a confession of non-belief in inherent human immortality. I was quite unprepared for so much pro-

gress as this in opposition to orthodoxy. I hope the little book will do him as much good as it has done us. I never saw so clearly before the nature of the Christian Redemption; from what a loss Christ saves us; and how "great" a "salvation" is that which he effects. Formerly I regarded the scheme of Redemption as achieving for us something involving all the difference between eternal happiness and eternal misery. Now I regard it as that which achieves for us a condition involving all the difference between non-entity and everlasting existence. I think the latter salvation a greater one than the former. The former does not gain *life* for us—we are supposed to have that already; it merely superadds felicity to life. The latter brings us right out of the dark blank of oblivion and nothingness, into a state of conscious existence, and throws (so to speak) *bliss* into the bargain. To my mind this is vastly a *greater* salvation than the orthodox redemption. And, indeed, orthodoxy stands charged with robbing Christ of the largest part of his glory in the work of human redemption; and remains (unwittingly) exposed to the curse in the end of the Apocalypse against those who add too, and diminish from, the words of inspiration. This is a redeeming scheme (I mean that out of death into life), which challenges my respect and homage. The other scheme, I admit, compelled *gratitude*, but (if it be no irreverence to say it) not *respect*. To go to Christ as an escape from the torment of eternal fire, always seemed to me so vulgar and *Mahometan* an idea, that one feels he could not condescend to it.

Again I thank you for the small book. As I read it, my heart cleaved to the Savior with an unwonted intensity. No one can drink deeply into these views without loving Christ ten-fold more than before."

———o———

PRIDE OF STATION.—Persons in eminent stations are wont to disapprove of whatever is contrary to law and received usage, and to deny to others the privilege of neglecting and repudiating this usage which they assume to themselves. Thus it happened that many who were very sparing of their own worship of the gods, took offence at the early Christians for their contempt of the state-religion, and taxed them with mere obstinacy, because they steadily refused to burn incense on the altars of the gods, or to swear by the genius of the Emperor.—*Kitto's Journal.*

———o———

PLEDGES to aid in publishing "*Bible vs. Tradition*," if paid soon will greatly aid us. We have already paid out double what we have received in getting that work forward. It will cost more than we expected, and it is likely to make upwards of 300 pages. Unless all that has been pledged is received early, and our friends make exertions to help us dispose of the work, we shall be heavily loaded by the undertaking to publish it. We intended to have had it out by this time; but we have been hindered by absence and otherwise: over 200 pages of it, however, are stereotyped, and the remainder will be pushed forward as fast as possible. Though the work will be larger than was calculated, the retail price will not exceed 75 cents, bound. Any person sending us *one dollar* will help us, and shall have a copy sent free of cost, by mail, or otherwise, as soon as it is issued.

———o———

HAM'S WORKS.—We have just issued another edition of his "*Life and Death*, or the Theology of the Bible in relation to *Human Immortality*." We call the attention of all to the fact that we have *reduced* the price of these valuable works so low that there is no excuse for not circulating them. The two should go together. We now retail them at *ten* cents per copy: or ten copies will be sent for one dollar, and *we* pay the postage; 24 copies for $2, or 100 copies for $7, will be sent at our expense. Let them be scattered.

———o———

"REVIEWER REVIEWED;" or, *A Dialogue in Reply to Eld. J. G. Stearns on Immortality.* We have just issued a new edition of this work. *Price reduced* to five cents single copy; or $2,50 per hundred, for cash. The first edition has been circulated, and a part of the second. *Thirty* copies will be sent for $1, free of postage if ordered to one address.

———o———

For the Bible Examiner

OUR DEPARTED FRIENDS.

Our friends who walked in wisdom's ways,
And now have left us mourning here,
When time shall bring the end of days,
Shall with their Lord then reappear.

We wept—we laid them in the grave,
It was God's will, we murmured not,
Tho' long we tried the loved to save,
They are sleeping now—but not forget.

The marble speaks their name, their age,
But more than that what can it tell?
But in our hearts, there is a page,
Which memory has recorded well.

They sleep—but oh! not *lost* in death,
In quiet hope they sweetly rest,
For *he* the resurrection saith,
They yet *shall live*, and be most blest.

Farewell—we meet no more on earth,
This mortal, will immortal be,
And be restored by heavenly birth,
Death's empire's not—when Christ sets free.

Now by their graves why do we weep?
Death was release—it was a gain;
Death to the good, is but a sleep,
From which they shall awake again.

GEO.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VIII. NEW YORK, MAY, 1853. NO. 5.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 140 Fulton-street, (Up Stairs.)

TERMS.--Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

HISTORICAL INQUIRY.

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM.

Continued from page 51.

FROM THE FIFTH TO THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY; OR, AGE OF "THE REFORMATION."

The impulse given to the speculative spirit by the introduction into Christianity, of the philosophic element of Platonism, in the second century, was by no means restrained during the period of which we are writing. Indeed, it is notorious that, from the time of this admixture of human and Divine science to the present hour, the doctrine of human immortality has been built up on a ratiocinative and logical basis merely, and the Bible has been very coolly ignored as if it had no deliverance to make on the matter. As we have already seen, the doctors of the soul's immortality had become the orthodox and popular faith of the Church, but the doctrine still disagreed on the question. They who held the dualistic theory, or a twofold division of man into body and soul, affirmed the broad proposition that the soul was an independent and immortal substance. The advocates of the threefold division into body, soul, and spirit, denied the immortality of the soul, as did the earlier Greek theologians, and maintained that the soul becomes immortalized by its union with the spirit. Nicholas, of Methone, was the champion of this philosophical doctrine in the Greek Church. Ullman, quoted by Hagenbach, thus reports him, "It is not every soul that neither perishes nor dies, but only the rational, truly spiritual, and divine soul, which is made perfect through virtue, by participation in the grace of God. For the souls of irrational beings, and still more of plants, may perish with the things which they inhabit, because they cannot be separated from the bodies which are composed, and may be dissolved into their elements." Elsewhere he says, "When any created being is eternal, it is not so *by* itself, nor *in* itself, nor *for* itself, but by the goodness of God; for all that is made and created has a beginning, and retains its existence, only through the goodness of the Creator." In the Western churches the doctrine of the soul's intrinsic immortality was taught as a theological truth; but the chief leaders of the scholastic sect, Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, were at issue on the question whether the doctrine was capable of being satisfactorily proved by the independent reason. Aquinas had drawn a distinction between the *sensitive* soul (*anima sensitiva*) and the *rational* soul (*anima intellectiva*), which enabled him to ascribe immortality to the latter, or rational part of man's nature only. "The rational principle (*intellectivum principium*) which," he says, "we call the human soul, is incorruptible." The mode of proof which he adopted is that which has been often used since, and is with some an argument still. "The human reason," he argued, "conceives itself absolute and adequate to all time. Hence whatever has reason has naturally a desire to live always. But a natural desire cannot be without its object, therefore every rational substance (*intellectualis substantia*) is incorruptible or immortal." The validity of this mode of proof was not so apparent as to command universal assent. Scotus refused to accept it, and replied that the "immortality of the soul cannot be logically proved." The Scholastics, of the Aristotelian school, generally denied any inherent immortality in man. Aristotle himself said that immortality was not inherent in the constitution of man, but was communicated [*thusathen*]. But the Platonists labored hard, at the close of this period, to establish their favorite dogma of the soul's immortality. All their philosophical strength was brought to bear against the Aristotelian theory, in which they were most effectively aided by the Pope, who came in with his baton of infallibility, and at once decided the controversy by the dictum of spiritual authority. A Council of the Lateran, held A. D. 1513, under Pope Leo X., pronounced the proper immortality of the soul an article of Christian faith, and discarded the distinction between theological and philosophical truths as untenable. The following is a translation of the Canon which was enacted at this Council, as published by Caranza:—

> "Whereas, in these our days, some have dared to assert concerning the nature of the reasonable soul, that it is mortal, and one or the same in all men; and some, rashly philosophizing, declare this to be true, at least according to philosophy. We, with the approbation of the sacred Council, do condemn and reprobate all those who assert that the intellectual soul is mortal, or one and the same in all men, and those who call these things in question: seeing that the soul is not only truly, and of itself, and essentially the form of the human body, as is expressed in the Canon of Pope Clement the Fifth, published in the General Council of Vienna, but likewise immortal, and, according to the number of bodies into which it is infused, is singularly multipliable, multiplied, and to be multiplied. * * And seeing that truth never contradicts truth, we determine every assertion, which is contrary to revealed faith, to be false; and we strictly inhibit all from dogmatizing otherwise, and we decree that all who adhere to the like erroneous assertions shall be shunned and punished as heretics."

However, neither Popes nor Councils can lay any effective embargo on thought. Men, endowed with mental independence, cannot be brought to acquiesce in the mere authoritative decisions of their fellow-men, though wearing the triple mitre of spiritual

absolutism. And *this* Council, Luther says, was of so little authority as to be laughed at and despised by the Romanists themselves. The most notable philosopher of Italy, in Leo's time, was Pietro Pomponazzo. This distinguished man took upon himself to maintain that the soul is absolutely mortal. Extracts from Papal letters by Contelori, show that Pietro was immediately and peremptorily assailed on the opinion which he had avowed. "Pietro, of Mantua," it is there said, "has asserted that, according to the principles of philosophy, and the opinion of Aristotle, the rational soul is, or appears to be mortal, contrary to the determination of the Lateran Council. The Pope commands that the said Pietro retract, or otherwise that he be proceeded against." The Pontificate of Leo was an epoch in the history of the doctrine of the soul's immortality. It was then that the successful effort was made to establish and give permanence to this doctrine; but it was made by a usurper of the right of private judgment, and accomplished by an act of sacerdotal despotism. The advocates of the doctrine of the soul's immortality need to be reminded of this suspicious passage in its historic progress. The seal of authority was annexed to it by a Roman Pontiff, in the dawn of the sixteenth century,—a man, the worthy counterpart of England's Charles II.,—fond of fashion and field sports, and mixing up in all the dissipated excesses of the sacred metropolis. Such was his extravagance, that "the charge has been laid at his door," says Ranke, "that he ran through the wealth of three Pontificates,—that of his predecessor, from whom he inherited a considerable treasure; his own, and that of his successor, to whom he bequeathed a mass of debt." "It certainly cannot be denied," says the same historian, "that his life did not correspond to that befitting the supreme head of the Church." It was during the Pontificate of Leo the Tenth that Luther visited Rome, and where the licentiousness of the Papal court and clergy so astonished and disgusted him, that from that time his reverence for the Pope was completely and for ever destroyed. What must have been the corrupt influence of this Papal oracle of orthodoxy, when in Rome it was a characteristic of good society to dispute the fundamental elements of Christianity! "One passes no longer," says P. Ant. Bandino, "for an accomplished man, unless he entertain some heterodox notions of Christianity." "At Court," proceeds Ranke, "they spoke of the institutions of the Catholic Church, of passages in the Holy Scriptures, only in a tone of jesting; the mysteries of faith were held in derision." Such was Pope Leo the Tenth, and such the circle of sanctified society of which he was the animating centre!—Behold, ye asserters of your own inherent immortality, the worthy "nursing-father" of your faith!—the hero of a hey-day heterodoxy!—the jolly jester with the solemn sanctities of Scripture!—the mocker of the sacred mysteries! Worthy patron of a Pagan progeny! Let it be registered as the genuine genealogy of a fundamental doctrine of modern British Christendom, that the Pagan Plato was its father, and the profligate Pope Leo its foster-father. Born and bred by the Pagan Philosophy and the protege of Popery, this notion of the soul's immortality has become a pet dogma of Popular Protestantism, which, with a strange forgetfulness of its low lineage, openly declares it to be the honorable offspring of a true orthodoxy!

FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE PRESENT TIME.

Papal influence had been declining for some time previous to the Reformation; but by the dawn of the sixteenth century, it reached the nadir of its popularity. The character of Leo X., and the condition of his Court, as we have already seen, were anything but adapted to inspire respect for the triple crown. As the symbol of a spiritual dominion, it was very generally despised, and only a suitable opportunity was wanted to give unmistakable expression to the reactionary feeling which extensively pervaded this age. Luther afforded this opportunity; and by his manly though perilous course, delivered his own and subsequent generatfons from the powerful spell of Papal absolutism. The great German Reformer assumed an unwonted position in the giant presence of Papal infallibility. The old orthodox obsequiousness was spurned by the strong individuality and godly sincerity of his spirit. He spoke disdainfully of the decrees of Popes, after he discovered the deference due to the Word of God. The decrees of Pope Leo, for the reasons before assigned, he had a special contempt for. He thus ironically responded to the decree of the Council of the Lateran held during the pontificate of this Pope:—"I permit the Pope to make articles of faith for himself and his faithful,—such as the soul is the substantial form of the human body.—*the soul is immortal*,—with all those *monstrous opinions* to be found in the Roman dunghill of decretals; that such as his faith is, such may be his gospel, such his disciples, and such his church, that the mouth may have meat suitable for it, and the dish a cover worthy of it." The belief of Luther is plainly expressed in these words, on the doctrine of the soul's immortality; it is evident that *he* refused to acknowledge this doctrine. The philosophy of Luther led him to conceive of the human soul as a distinct, but not an immortal, subsistence. The soul, he imagined, was separated from the body in death; but he did not believe in its continued consciousness between death and resurrection. He embraced and taught the doctrine of the *sleep of the soul*, and continued in that belief to the close of his life.

The prominence given by Luther to the doctrines of the non-immortality of the soul, and its unconsciousness in death, induced Sir Thomas More to publish a work in reply, objecting to the views advocated by the Reformer. This reply of More's called another distinguished witness into the arena of controversy,—William Tyndale, the translator:—"In putting departed souls in heaven, hell, and purgatory," says Tyndale, "you destroy the arguments wherewith Christ and Paul prove the resurrection. What God doth with them, that shall we know when we come to them. The true faith putteth the *resurrection*, which we be warned *to look for every hour*. The heathen philosophers denying *that*, did put that souls did ever live. And the Pope joineth the spiritual doctrine of Christ and the fleshly doctrine of philosophers together,—things so contrary that they cannot agree.....And because the fleshly-minded Pope consenteth unto heathen doctrine, therefore he corrupteth the Scriptures to establish it....If the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be not in as good case as the angels be? And then what cause is there of the resurrection?" Sir Thomas More asked,—"What shall he care, how long he live in sin that believeth Luther, that he

shall after this life feel neither good nor evil in body nor soul, until the day of doom?" To which Tyndale replied,—"Christ and his Apostles taught no other, but warned *to look for Christ's coming again every hour; which coming again, because ye believe will never be, therefore have ye feigned that other merchandize.*"

The above quotations prove that the present popular doctrines of the immortality of the soul, and a state of conscious life between death and resurrection, were not doctrines held by Luther and the first Reformers. Luther calls them "monstrous opinions,"—and Tyndale declares that they were "heathen" and "fleshly doctrines," and subversive of the Scripture doctrines of Christ's second coming and the resurrection from the dead.

Calvin now entered the arena, by the publication of a tractate entitled "Psychopannychia," a word of Greek derivation, intended to express the idea that the soul is awake in a state of consciousness thro' the whole night of death. "As to the book itself," writes an anonymous reviewer in the year 1772, "it is hot, furious, and abusive. The Hypnologists [sleep-preachers] as he [Calvin] calls them, are babblers, madmen, dreamers, drunkards, &c. Happily for them, his arguments are as feeble and sophistical as they themselves could wish." From Calvin's time, the doctrine of the soul's immortality, and its dependent dogmas, have gradually found their way into the several Protestant confessions; and to this hour, these heathen heresies are accepted by the Romish, and all the Reformed Churches, as Christian verities.

In the year 1706, Henry Dodwell, a clergyman of celebrity, espoused the doctrine of the mortality of the soul, and so revived the controversy. He associated, however, with his subject some singular notions, the nature of which will be best perceived by the following copy of the title page of his book. "An Epistolary Discourse, proving from the Scriptures, and the First Fathers, that the Soul is a Principle Naturally Mortal; but Immortalized actually by the pleasure of God to Punishment, or to Reward, by its Union with the Divine Baptismal Spirit. Wherein is Proved that none have the power of giving this Divine Immortalizing Spirit, since the Apostles, but only the BISHOPS." [!!] This book called out several antagonists; and the "learned Dodwell," as he was respectfully called, had the satisfaction of seeing this question of the soul's immortality again very widely agitated, and warmly debated.

The controversy throughout has, as we have seen, been too much mixed up with philosophical and ecclesiastical tradition. The Reformers spoke of the *sleep of the soul*, implying the old Platonic idea, that the *soul* is a *distinct subsistence*,—and, indeed, that it is the essential human being in a state of torpor, which they called its "sleep" or "rest." Dodwell reasons like a clerical believer in baptismal regeneration, differing from the modern Tractarian school in this respect,—that his regeneration was *physical*, whereas theirs is spiritual only. It has remained to our own times, to see the doctrine put in its proper light, although it is still but very imperfectly apprehended by some advocates, as well as opponents. The true statement of the doctrine, we apprehend, does not concern the *soul*, or *spirit*,—but MAN. We should not ask whether the *soul* is mortal or immortal; but whether *man* is one or the other. The Scripture teaches nothing about the *soul* as a *subsistence distinct from the body*. Man is sometimes called *flesh*, and sometimes *soul*,—"All *flesh*," "Man became a living *soul*," &c.

Bishop Law, the author of the "Call to the Unconverted," in an "Appendix" to his "Considerations on the Theory of Religion," published in 1755, shook to its foundations the popular doctrine of a *conscious* intermediate state. Dr. Warburton also laid himself open to the suspicion of heterodoxy on this subject, in his third edition of the "Divine Legation of Moses," published in 1752.—In his fourth edition of that work, he altered his phraseology, which had given occasion to the suspicion, not however without incurring the charge of trimming to popular prejudice. Many eminent Biblical scholars, since Law's time, have turned their attention to this controversy. In the city of Norwich it was mooted by the labors of Mr. Bourne, and also by Mr. John Marsom, who, in addition to the publication of two small volumes, which have passed through two editions, advocated his opinions in the *Monthly Repository*. The controversy has passed through what we may call its *philosophical* period, and is now, by most thinking and well-read persons, acknowledged to be a Bible question. In this all but universal admission we rejoice, as tending to popularize a subject so necessary to be understood by all, whether learned or unlearned. We are thankful that the advanced intelligence of our own times has been through the fallacy of the "Argument from Reason;" and that such elaborate sophisms as Mr. Samuel Drew's "Essay" are universally voted to the shelf, as now altogether beside the question, which, at one time, they were thought so triumphantly to elucidate, and even to settle.

The theological writings of the learned Dr. Whately, Archbishop of Dublin, have exercised considerable influence in reviving the controversy in our own times. The scholastic popularity, as well as ecclesiastical eminence of this dignitary of the English Church, have secured for his writings an amount of attention and respect beyond those of his contemporaries. His work, entitled "A View of the Scripture Revelations concerning a Future State," has been extensively read by professional theologians; and since the publication of this book, many others have issued from the press, from the pens of both clergymen and Nonconformist ministers. The Rev. Reginald Courtenay, Rector of Thornton Watlass, issued, in the year 1843, a goodly octavo volume under the title of "The Future States," advocating the unpopular side of the question, and which he dedicated to Archbishop Whately. This was followed, in the ensuing year, by a little work called "Notes of Lectures," afterwards considerably amplified in a clever and closely reasoned book, published in 1846, by H. H. Dobney, a Baptist Minister, at Maidstone, entitled "The Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment." Almost simultaneously with this work of Mr. Dobney's, appeared a volume from the pen of Mr. Edward White, a Congregational Minister, in Hereford. Mr. White's book, "Life in Christ," contains much valuable matter in defence of the non-immortality of man, and the final destruction of the wick-

ed. Since these works, others have issued from the press. Three Nonconformist ministers, one in Edinburgh, another in Bristol, and the third in Plymouth, have, in addition to their public testimony as preachers, put on record their convictions in pamphlets and larger works. Mr. W. Glen Moncrieff, a Congregational Minister in Edinburgh, has published his "Dialogues on Future Punishment," a work on "Soul," and is about to issue a companion to the foregoing, to be entitled "Spirit." Besides these, Mr. Moncrieff has edited a pamphlet by Mr. Grew, of Philadelphia, U. S., called the "Intermediate State." In the spring of 1849, Mr. J. Panton Ham, Congregational Minister, of Bristol, issued a volume of lectures on "Life and Death; or the Theology of the Bible in relation to Human Immortality." The first edition of this book sold in the first year of its publication; and a second, somewhat enlarged, was sent forth in the spring of 1851. As a supplement to this work, he issued another, entitled "The Generations Gathered and Gathering; or the Scripture Doctrine concerning Man in Death." Both these books have since been republished in New-York, U. S.

A distinguished writer against the popular doctrine of inherent natural immortality, has appeared in the person of the Regius Professor of Modern History, at Cambridge,—the Right Hon. Sir James Stephen. The views of this writer are very candidly expressed in "The Epilogue" to his recently published "Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography," a series of papers originally contributed to the *Edinburgh Review*. An attempt was made, in the University of which Sir James Stephen is a member and Professor, to affix the stigma of heresy on him for the publication of these opinions; the attempt, however, failed. The following report appeared in the *Times* newspaper, of Thursday, Oct. 30, 1851.—"Cambridge. Congregation.—The Professor of Modern History.—It was proposed by the Rev. Lucius Arthur, M. A., of Trinity College, to offer the following grace to the Senate, in connection with the works of Sir James Stephen: 'Cum falsa doctrina in religione omnino cavenda sit: Placeat vobis ut fiat inquisitio in opiniones a Professore Historiæ recentiores vulgatas.' Essays in Eccles. Biography; the Epilogue. The grace was, however, rejected in the caput." All honor to the Senate for resisting this piece of clerical impertinence and tyranny!

It is due the untiring activity of Mr. Geo. Storrs, of New York, that we should make honorable mention of him, in connection with these controversies. Mr. Storrs is the editor of a monthly periodical, called the "*Bible Examiner*," and has written and preached very extensively on his side of the Atlantic. He has been testifying to these truths for the past twelve years, and been the means of raising up many advocates of these Gospel principles, in different parts of the States.

Once more the controversy is revived both in Great Britain and America, and has been publicly acknowledged by several writers, who have labored to fortify the popular faith. The Congregational Lecture of the late Dr. Winter Hamilton, entitled, "The Revealed Doctrine of Rewards and Punishments," and "Athanasia; or four books on Immortality," by the Rev. J. Howard Hinton, A. M., are the principal responses on the "orthodox" side, in Great Britain. Some writers and preachers, misapprehending the position of those who advocate the natural mortality of man, and that immortality is a gift of God communicated to believers only through Christ, have helped, by their unreflecting and angry impatience, to foment much bitter feeling, and to stir up a blind and uncharitable opposition. False and opprobrious epithets have been freely applied to the advocates of the so-called "new doctrine,"—a mode of warfare which is happily much less harmful than it used to be. It is now generally regarded as the evidence of a weak cause, or personal inability to defend a cause, when recourse is had to opprobrious name-calling, and offensive personalities. Bullying is not a legitimate weapon in the battle of truth, and can never be acceptable except to the bantling and the bigot. It is to be earnestly hoped, that these great fundamental inquiries will be prosecuted in the present age, in that spirit of seriousness and sanctity becoming their nature and importance. We may "contend earnestly for the faith," without discourtesy and uncharitableness towards those who differ from us; and a contest courteously carried on is most likely to result in a mutual agreement, and that in the truth.

A word, in conclusion, on the importance of the doctrinal inquiries which have been the subjects of this historical sketch. Some, convinced of the unscriptural character of the popular or "orthodox" doctrine of human immortality, and of the duty of laboring to disabuse the public mind of this false doctrine, yet disagree with those who inculcate the implied truth of an intermediate state of unconsciousness, as the condition of man between death and resurrection. With some, its offensiveness to our human sympathies is the reason why they would have it held in abeyance. With others, as Mr. Dobney, the Scriptures are considered not to have made a very clear and satisfactory deliverance on the subject; and again, with others, as Mr. Edward White, the state of intermediate unconsciousness is only the condition of the deceased wicked, the righteous being actually quickened or made alive at the time of their regeneration or conversion, and so passing, at the time of death, into a new state of disembodied existence. None of these objections appear to us to have any real validity. The sentimentality of the first may be passed by without notice. The opinions of Messrs. Dobney and White have received due respect elsewhere,* where, we think, it has been conclusively shown that the Scriptures abound in the most unambiguous and harmonious evidence in favor of the unconscious intermediate state. The relation of this doctrine to the Christian doctrines of resurrection, and the premillennial advent of Christ, is obvious. It adds a new emphasis to the cry, "Come, Lord Jesus!" and gives a prominence, unknown to the popular theology, to the official dignity of Christ, as the "Resurrection and the Life." Besides the aspect of this doctrine of unconsciousness in death to other related *truths* revealed in the Scriptures, its aspect towards certain *errors* is no less obvious and important. Deprive Popery of these two false dogmas,—the immortality of the soul, and its separate and conscious state in death,—and you deprive that

* Generations Gathered and Gathering; or the Scripture Doctrine concerning Man in Death, by J. Panton Ham. Moncrieff's edition of Grew's Intermediate State.

monster system of spiritual wickedness of its prestige, and terrible influence. Protestantism is weak in the presence of this ancient foe, because to a considerable extent, it stands on a common doctrinal platform. It grants to Popery the very foundations of its anti-scriptural and mischievous dogmas. Let Protestants echo the voice of the Bible through the length and breadth of the land, on the doctrine of immortality,—let them exhibit its decisive testimony against the pagan heresies of the soul's immortality, separate state, and consciousness in death, and this hoary heresiarch would meet with such an antagonist as it has never encountered before. Its *deified Virgin*, and its *Pantheon of Saint-gods*, could not stand before it,—to invoke them would appear, what it really is, a vain calling upon the silent dead. The great Popish bugbear, *Purgatory*, if there were no disembodied souls to be tortured therein, would pass away like a dark foul vapor from the abused imaginations of men; and *Indulgences*, that Popish scheme of raising money under false pretences, would be so thoroughly exposed, as to need an *indulgent* people to prevent a terrible popular reaction against the religious rascality of the whole Papal priesthood. The honor of God, the consistency of Christian doctrine, and the emancipation of mankind from the worst spiritual thraldom, unite to urge on this great doctrinal reformation.—Every believer of these important truths should add the weight of his personal testimony, and cast in all his personal influence, to give prominence and success to such a controversy. There are laborers now in the high places of the field, bearing, almost single-handed and alone, the burden and heat of the day,—whose voice unites with the voice of God, of Christ, and of the truth, urging their fellow-believers to come openly to their help, and the help of the Lord, against the mighty. Let not this united appeal be in vain. The proof of faith is faithfulness. He that has convictions, if he have also a conscience, will confess. The claims are complete, which this divine cause makes on Christian candor and self-denial. We trust they will be reverently heeded, that this work of reform may be carried on to its final and triumphant consummation.

SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

BY THE RIGHT HON. SIR JAMES STEPHEN, K.C.B.

Prof. of Modern History in the University of Cambridge.

The real, though often unavowed, ground of the doubts which are overclouding the spirits of so many of the nominal disciples of Christ, is the hopeless dejection with which they contemplate that part of the Christian scheme which is supposed to consign the vast majority of our race to a future state, in which woe inconceivable in amount, is also eternal in duration. From this doctrine the hearts of most men turn aside, not only with an instinctive horror, but with an invincible incredulity; and of those who believe that it really proceeded from the lips of Christ himself, many are sorely tempted by it either to doubt the divine authority of any of his words, or to destroy their meaning by conjectural evasions of their force.

There are, indeed, others to whom it appears irreverent and even impious to hold parley with such doubts at all. They forbid us to inquire whether the generally received sense of our Redeemer's language on this melancholy and overwhelming theme, be really the sense in which he spoke. They resent, as mere conceit and arrogance, the opposition of the human understanding to what they consider as the unequivocal declarations of the Son of God himself; and demand that every voice which would presume to controvert those declarations should be subdued into a submissive silence. And most just is the rebuke, and most reasonable the demand, if it be indeed the fact that our Divine Teacher has really revealed to us the eternity of the punishment inflicted in a future state for the sins of men in this life. For, as the truth of God is the corner-stone of all religion, so the truth of Christ is the corner-stone of Christianity.

Disclaiming, therefore, the very slightest sympathy with that arrogance which would reject any part of divine revelation on the ground of its inconsistency with the dogmas of human wisdom, we would yet (in the exercise of that freedom which all Protestants, in terms at least, assert for themselves and allow to others), venture to inquire, or rather to suggest the inquiry, whether any sufficient authority really exists for asserting that either Christ himself, or his Apostles, taught the doctrine of a penal retribution, which is to be "eternal" in the sense in which we believe the Deity Himself to be "eternal."

* * * * *

The Bible teaches us that Christ came into the world to bruise the serpent's head, to destroy the works of the devil, and to establish the kingdom of God; and Christ himself declared that "He saw Satan like lightning fall from Heaven." Is it reasonable to accept any construction of the other words of Christ, which would ascribe to the Spirit of Evil an eternal triumph over the Spirit of Good, in the persons of the vast majority of the race whom He lived and died to redeem?

* * * * *

Throughout the holy Scriptures a constant appeal is made to those moral sentiments which God has himself implanted in our nature. Our heavenly Father has graciously condescended everywhere to point out to us the sacred harmony between his law as revealed by prophets and evangelists, and his law as written by himself on our hearts; and from that harmony we are taught to draw the best and highest proof of the inspiration of those sacred writings. Deeply conscious with what profound reverence it behoves us to apply that test of truth to any opinion deduced by the Church at large from holy Scripture, we may yet venture to inquire whether it could be successfully applied to the case under consideration? If the words ascribed to our Saviour are not inexorably bound down to the construction they usually receive, by the absolutely inflexible force of the text and of the context, is it not most reasonable to adopt some other construction, to which our own natural sense of justice and equity can respond as clearly as it responds to all the rest of the inspired canon?

So inveterate is the corruption of the human heart, that, in the judgment of some, the infliction and announcement of no penalty less than that of eternal misery would be sufficient to turn it aside from present sinfulness. But does the dread of

that terrific penalty really stem the headlong current of iniquity? Is it really productive of any corresponding alarm? Does it produce an alarm equal to that which would have been excited by the announcement of a penalty of infinitely less amount, but definite and intelligible? Does the world—does the Church—do her ministers—do her saints—really believe this part of the language of our Redeemer in that sense in which they familiarly interpret it? Is any human mind so constituted as to bear the incumbent weight of so fearful a probability of an evil so utterly beyond the reach of exaggeration? Is the texture of any human body vigorous enough to sustain the throes of so agonizing an anticipation? What means the whole course and system of life which is passing hourly before our eyes, and through which we are ourselves passing? Why have our preachers time to engage in study, to harmonize the periods of their sermons, to give heed to our wretched ecclesiastical disputes, to devote one superfluous instant to food, to repose, or to occupy themselves with any other thing than the proclamation of the horrors of the approaching calamity, and the explanation of the only way of escape from it? Let any honest man fairly propose to himself, and fairly answer the question, whether the unutterable disparity between his actual interest in all the frivolities of life, and his professed belief in an eternity of woe, impending probably over himself, but certainly over the vast majority of the human race, does not convict him of professing to believe more than he actually believes? And, if so, is there not some reason to doubt whether he has not erred in attributing to his Saviour a meaning, for which, after all, he cannot find any real place in his own mind, or any vital influence in his own heart?

Nothing can be more remote from the design with which these pages are written than to suggest a doubt whether penal retribution in the future state does really await "the many who are called," but who throng "the broad way which leadeth to destruction." Neither does the writer of these pages presume to intimate that either the nature or the continuance of that penalty are such as to be fitly contemplated by any soul of man without the most profound awe and the most lively alarm. To propagate or to entertain such opinions, would be to question the truth of Him who is emphatically himself "the Truth." The questions proposed for inquiry are—whether He, or any of his inspired Apostles, has really affirmed, in express words, that the retribution shall be endured eternally by those on whom it shall fall?—whether all the words employed by Him, or by them, on the subject are not satisfied by understanding that the punishment is eternal only inasmuch as it involves the ULTIMATE DESTRUCTION, OR ANNIHILATION, of those on whom it is to be inflicted?—whether the sense usually ascribed to this part of holy Scripture is congruous with the spirit of the rest of the revealed will of God?—whether it is not really derived from *ecclesiastical traditions*, rather than from any sound and unbiassed criticism?—and whether our own translators have not been induced, by those traditions, to enhance the real force of our Saviour's words by a forced and exaggerated version of them?

* * * * *

This digression (if such it be) from the more immediate subject of these pages, has been suggested, and may, it is hoped, be vindicated, by the consideration, that the generally received opinion regarding the endless duration of the state of punishment, is among the most effective of all the causes which are at present inducing amongst us that virtual abandonment of Christianity, which assigns a mythic sense to almost every part of the sacred oracles.—Learnedly and wisely as that fallacy has been combated by many, their yet more serious attention might, perhaps, be advantageously given to the inquiry whether that opinion, which is to so large a number an insuperable rock of offence, might not be either retracted or qualified without any sacrifice of truth; and whether, if so, they would not contribute, by such an acknowledgment, to reclaim the deserters to the camp much more effectually than by any assault on the positions in which they have openly entrenched themselves.—*Chris. Examiner, Eng.*

THOUGHTS ON ROMANS VIII. 13.

BY REV. EDWARD WHITE, LONDON.

"For if ye live after the flesh ye shall die; but if ye, through the Spirit, do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live."

In these words the apostle presents to our view the two forms of human life, the fleshly and the spiritual, and their respective consequences, Death and Life Eternal. Consider therefore,

1st. What is the exact signification of the phrase "*living after the flesh.*" We may be certain that there are two things which the Apostle does not mean. He does not intend by this phrase, the occasional sins, infirmities, and slips, of good men.—No man in the estimation of God is thoroughly sinless; yet in those who shall be saved, there is implanted a victorious principle of moral and spiritual excellence, which, under favorable circumstances, would speedily develop itself as a divine nature triumphant over the last vestiges of evil in the human constitution. Neither does the Apostle intend by this expression "living after the flesh," the habit of attending to duties on earth which spring out of fleshly relationships. There are some persons who spend the first half of their lives as if there were no God; and the second half as if there were no world. But the spirit of true religion displays itself, not in the affectations of asceticism, nor in the ambition to become an angel before the time. It is a family spirit. It is intended to make good husbands, good wives, good parents, good children, good masters, good servants, good neighbors, good citizens; and if it does not accomplish this, it accomplishes nothing. Men are to be judged according to the deeds done in the body.

"The flesh" is the scriptural term employed to designate the unreformed nature of man, in its totality. To walk after the flesh is to follow the course of a sinful world. It is to lead a life without God, without prayer, without truth, without self-restraint, without love,—a life of business without a religious aim, or a life of pleasure without any reference to principle,—a life which is a mere struggle for existence and amusement, without grace to ennoble it now, or glory to crown it hereafter. It is such a life as that which is led by the overwhelm-

ing majority of our fellow-creatures; whether we regard the victims of grossness and debauchery, or the more refined millions of triflers who people the civilized world. The human nature was formed to be a temple of the Deity,—to enshrine the thought of God as the ruling power, as the Jewish temple contained the Shekinah at Jerusalem; and whensoever a human life is spent thus, "without God in the world," the residuum is "flesh," and its "end is to be burned."

2d. The Apostle declares what shall be the proper penalty of such a career,—"If ye live after the flesh *ye shall die*." In the Greek the expression is peculiarly marked and emphatic,—"ye are about to die," or "ye are on the point of death." It is a phrase composed of two verbs; which are thus translated in John 4: 47—"and besought Jesus to heal his son, for he was *at the point of death*."—Here the phrase is the same with that which in our text is translated, "ye shall die." All life around us is transitory, vegetable and animal. It passes away with the organisms which it animated; like the frost-work on our windows in winter when the sun appears. An animal life on the part of mankind—a life after the flesh, will result also in *death*, "ye shall die!" "The letter or law of God *killeth*," 2 Cor. 3. "Bring hither mine enemies and slay them before me!" "The world *passeth away* and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." YE SHALL DIE! When the messengers of "Him that was dead and is alive again," declare that sinful persons shall *die*, it is not a far-fetched conclusion, but a reverential and honest inference from such a word, that they will literally *perish*, be *slain*, be *killed with death*, be *destroyed* body and soul: and it is in vain that men, in the face of such a threatening, flatter themselves with the possession of a natural immortality, or natural deathlessness. No; the word of God will be fulfilled. The wicked are at the point of death.—Christ comes quickly; and when he shall appear, he will execute the judgments of God against an impenitent world,—"in flaming fire taking vengeance against them that know not God and obey not the gospel of his Son." If fire be not an instrument of *destruction*, it must be a fire of a different nature from that well-known element so often spoken of in the Scriptures—"He will *burn up the chaff* with unquenchable fire."

Thus has God, the eternal being, duly warned mankind to improve wisely their span of life below. He offers us on one side, an existence in sin, which is, "but for a moment;" on the other, an existence in holy obedience, which is of everlasting duration. "Behold I set before you death and life, therefore choose life."

3d. "If ye through the spirit do mortify the deeds of the body." Man is helpless without the divine Life-giving spirit; but the human agency works out salvation along with the Divine. The stately ship floats on the heaving ocean with her sails set. The winds of heaven supply the motive force; but there is a voluntary navigation below and aloft which spreads the sails and guides the helm. Even thus the Spirit bloweth where it listeth, and furnishes the motive force in the heavenly voyage of the soul; but a voluntary intelligence spreads out the moral faculties to be filled with the Spirit, and yields itself to be impelled by the celestial gale.

The mortification of the animal nature, with its licentious and angry passions, is the great work of the Christian life. The power to accomplish this result must be derived from a positive, not a negative force. The monastic system of cheerless legality attempted this in the middle ages, and failed from want of a positive antagonist power. This is supplied to us by that truth which the Spirit teaches concerning Jesus our Lord. Here is the expulsive power of a new affection. Love to God in Christ must cast out sin; and we love him, in consequence of having something to love him for—because he hath first loved us—because he has visited us in our low estate of misery and degradation, with assurances of acceptance in the Beloved.

4th. "Ye shall live." United to God by faith and love, the believer becomes as indestructible as God. The Spirit of Truth, of beauty, of holiness, of power, of life, dwelling in him, he cannot perish. His life is carried forward into eternity along with that of the necessary being. Amidst the changes of creation and the conflagrations of the universe, the good man in Christ abides secure. His life is beyond the action of the elements, and is destined to the development of an endless history. If all the beams darting from all suns through immensity, represented lines of figures denoting years or centuries or millenniums of glory, these amazing suns combined or multiplied would form not even a sufficient unit of the arithmetic by which to measure the believer's life. It is something divine—and since divine, incomprehensible to man. The Christian embodies in his own person all those mysteries of love and life which dwelt in God; and it will require eternity for him to understand himself.

Reader! art thou living after the flesh—a momentary, damnable life of sin—a suicidal life to be speedily swallowed up by the devouring fire of Law; or art thou through the Spirit mortifying the deeds of the body, that thou mayest live *for ever*?—[*Moncrieff's*] *Expositor*.

—o—

THE SCIENCE OF SCRIPTURE WORDS.—BODY.

Paul speaks of "the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body," Rom. 3: 23, but it is questionable if here, and in similar instances, "body" is not used for *self*, and, if such be the case, he means the redemption of *ourselves*, or simply *our* redemption from the grave to live immortally with Jesus. Examples can easily be found in which the term "body" expresses the whole of man, whatever view may be taken of him, whether a compound of soul and spirit, or wholly soul. For instance:—"a body [entire humanity] hast thou prepared me;" Heb. 10: 5. "My substance," or, according to the margin, "my body [or I] was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret;" Psa. 139: 5. "That thy whole body [person—being] should be cast into hell," (*Gehenna*), Matt. 5: 29. "The light of the body [of the man] is the eye;" 6: 22. "The whole body [thou, or the whole man] shall be full of darkness;" 6: 23. "Through the offering of the body of Jesus," that is by the offering of Jesus, Heb. 10: 10. "The tongue defileth the whole body," (the whole man), James 3: 6. "Present your bodies [yourselves] a living sacrifice," Rom. 12: 1, &c. It is, then, clearly a scriptural mode of speech to import *entire man* by the word *body*, and we suggest that it is highly probable that such an

expression as "the redemption of the body" just signifies our final and complete redemption by the glorious resurrection, about which the Apostles and the early Christians delighted to speak so much.—*W. G. Moncrieff, Notes to Grew's Intermediate State.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, MAY, 1853.

SINCE the April Examiner was issued, we have traveled a thousand miles, and preached some twenty times, besides attending to getting out the Examiner for May, and bringing forward the "*Bible vs. Tradition.*" We have reason to thank the Lord for his preserving and sustaining mercy: but yet we feel that we have been over-taxed in body and mind. Nevertheless, work must be done. May the Lord raise up more laborers. Time is short—the work is great—and the reward glorious to the faithful. There is no cause to faint. If God be for us, who can be against us? Men of God, let us come up to the work, relying on Almighty aid.—Let praying men call upon God to strengthen his servants in their work and help them to speak boldly as we ought to speak; and let *substantial* aid accompany your prayers, that none who proclaim the truth need be compelled to leave the work to "*serve tables.*"

WHAT WE ABHOR.—A paper *smutted*, and the impression defective, so that the reader has to *guess* out letters and words; and is made to feel a tax on his patience. Such was the fate of a portion of our last Examiner; and tho' we had a 2nd edition printed to remedy the defect, we fear lest some found themselves supplied with a defective number; if so, and they will let us know it, we will send them a perfect copy.

"BIBLE VS. TRADITION."—We have at length got this work so far advanced that it will be ready for delivery in a few days. It has been no small labor to bring it out, even after Brs. Ellis and Read had spent so much time upon it. They have labored without compensation, and so have we thus far; and besides have involved ourself in a heavy pecuniary responsibility, of which we can only be relieved, by immediate sales or donations for that purpose. We hope those who have made pledges will remit immediately; and if all was now paid in that has been pledged it scarcely meets half the expense of publishing the work, without any allowance to either of us who have done the work. We have given some specimens of the book, and hope our friends will take interest enough in it to scatter it quickly and widely. The battle is waxing warmer every month; and the more intelligent of our opponents are making concessions to us which must ultimately bring them entirely off the old ground of endless sin and suffering. We have added to the work of Brs. Ellis and Read, "*The Historical Inquiry,*" by J. Panton Ham, which we have published in the Examiner; making thereby some twenty-four pages additional matter, of very deep interest and importance to those engaged in this controversy; and making the book now contain 312 pages, 12 mo. *Price 75 cents. Ten copies* will be sent for $5. The freight or postage must be at the expense of the purchaser. The weight, we expect, will be about 16 ounces. None of the work will be put up in paper covers.

VISIT WEST.—When we consented to visit Northern Indiana, some time the coming season, it was a matter of certainty that we would be importuned to visit many places on our route. This consideration made us reluctant to venture out that way at all, as it would be impossible for us to spend the time necessary to gratify our friends in the matter. If we had means to employ some competent person to do the work that must be attended to in New York, in our absence, then we would gladly spend two or three months in the West; but as it is, we see no way to enjoy the pleasure it would give us and our friends to visit the many places from which we have earnest appeals for a portion of our time. We consented some weeks ago to visit Middlebury, South Bend, and such other places in that part of Indiana as Br. Miller and the friends there should deem best; but informed them if *three weeks* would not answer for our stay among them, we could not come, as that would be the longest period we could be away from New York.

The time first fixed upon for our visit was the last of May; it has since been postponed to the last of August, on account of a pressure of circumstances in our affairs at home. At that time we will do the best we can about calling on the friends who have written us, but dare not make any positive promises at present.

"PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE."—It has been before stated what the object of this Committee is, viz: To search out and offer encouragement to men of God in the glorious work of proclaiming "Life and Immortality *only* through Jesus Christ." We announced, in the April Examiner, that Eld. J. S. White, of Worcester, Mass., had engaged to devote a part of his time to traveling in this cause,

under the patronage of our Prov. Com. Since then Eld. Jacob Blain, of Buffalo, N. Y., and Eld. C. M. Richmond, of Gowanda, N. Y., have been engaged to go out in the same work. Br. Richmond travels West through Ohio, laboring chiefly in central Indiana. We suppose he is now on his way.

To all who have ability to help, we appeal for aid, not by prayers only, but with "*material*" aid. Immortal-soulists may live on "*immateriality*" if they can; but *substantial* beings need and must have *substantial* aid. Now man—whosoever thou art—having this world's good, if you wish to lay it out profitably, so that thieves cannot steal it, nor speculators devour it, invest a portion in helping us in the work we are engaged in. It is time that "*Tophet*" was "*defiled*" as done by good King Josiah: see 2 Kings 23: 10. Self-styled orthodoxy has driven our "sons and daughters through the fire to Moloch" long enough. Let us wipe out this stain from the Christian name, and no longer "talk wickedly for God;" ascribing to him an abomination immeasurably worse than that of the children of Israel when they made their children pass through the fire to Moloch; for, in their case, Moloch's fire in Tophet—or Gehenna—*devoured* the suffering victim; but the god of this orthodoxy perpetuates, by his power, the existence, without end, of his victims; and tortures them without mercy and without the possibility of escape. It is time such blasphemy as this was put an end to; and we believe it is the will of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ that his friends should spare no pains, labor, or expense, in bringing to an end a system of doctrines which has forced men to hate God, or to offer to him only a hypocritical service to appease his wrath, that they might escape savage cruelty.

We rejoice that light is springing up—that the character of God is being better understood; and that *his love* to a perishing world is being made to appear through the dark clouds of false doctrine and superstition that have so long cursed our race.

Who will come up to the help of the Lord in the work before us? Now, do not turn away from this call, nor lay this paper down till you have resolved to do something *more* than you have yet done.—The Provisionary Committee are resolved, through the help of God, and your aid, that they will do more than they have done. If *you* have no funds to give, ask those to help us who have. Surely you can *talk*. Talk then to the hearts and pockets of those who can help with funds. *The work must be done;* and we must do it who love the truth, or our love for the truth will become *extinct;* and we shall slide back into death ourselves. *We must work to live;* and we *cannot live* if we do not work. *Up*, then, every man, woman, and child whose heart is for God, and to the work in earnest. We have no time to sleep. Moloch must be overthrown—"*Tophet*" *must be* "*defiled*," that God may no more be blasphemed by attributing to him a worse than Moloch work.

———o———

QUITE A STORM IN "EAST NEW JERSEY."—In the "*New York Recorder*,"—a Baptist paper—is a communciation from "Y." dated "*East New Jersey*, March 21, 1853." "Y." first blows a blast about there being "always something new under the sun"—"some new discovery in theology"—"some cackling novelty hatched by uneasy brains, to catch the popular mind"—and "running a tilt against wind-mills," with a string more of such like outbursts of a mind manifestly disturbed with fear that the earth may be proved a *globe* and not a *mere plain;* and terribly afraid that he shall not keep up the place of eternal torture to gratify his dislike of *change;* all of which we should regard as unworthy of notice if it had not appeared in a *religious* paper. After exhausting a little of his *extra steam*, which it seems was generated by reading our Six Sermons—as the sequel will show—he proceeds to say:—

"The 'old paths' are too worn and stale. Hence the eagerness with which 'new lights,' preachers with new tricks, pulpit performers with improved legerdemain, spiritual jugglers who can make God's Word utter strange things, and thrust 'sugar-coated' error down people's throats, are run after. Any man, now-a-days, who has a flippant tongue, a front of brass, and a new doctrine, can obtain a congregation and a vogue. He is all the greater prophet, all the more eagerly and easily swallowed, if he only professes to take his doctrine from the Word of God.

These remarks have been provoked by the perusal of a publication of one George Storrs, one of the chief priests of the doctrine of Annihilationism, the doctrine of the final destruction of the wicked. It professes to be, 'An Inquiry: Are the wicked immortal? In six sermons.' The author, of course, comes to the conclusion that the wicked are not immortal—in other words, that they will be annihilated. He gives us logic, and criticism, and exposition with a vengeance. I found the task of getting through these 'sermons' (shade of Paul!) too great for even an extra stock of patience and perseverance, laid in for the purpose. Such a mass of ill-begotten reasoning, such a rabble of verbiage, such a mess of tinkum tankum, I did not know there was a mortal who had the courage to perpetrate in print. The doctrine, however, has abler defenders than this Storrs. But, despite the man's flippancy and incoherence, people go to hear him; and, as I learn, people of mind and intelligence. It is said that, in the city of Paterson, where he has been for some time lecturing, on the Sabbath, three or four of the first men among the Methodists have embraced his views.

The doctrine of annihilation has plausible ground, and certainly, is not of so pernicious a character as that of Universalism. Many good men have believed it. Still, it is fraught with evil. It weakens the sanctions of truth. It furnishes a refuge for all those, not a small number, who wish to enjoy the pleasures of sin and escape the threatened penalty. It is folly to assert that the fear of annihilation will have more influence to deter men from sin than that of eternal torment. Our instincts teach the contrary."

What a tempest! Wonder if "East New Jersey" is all laid waste! What's the matter, friend "Y"? You are so near the bottom of the *alphabet*, who would have thought you could have been so stirred up. It is probable, however, you have been so far down in the scale of *letters* that you concluded it impossible to be reached; yet it seems the "Sermons," some how, have lifted you almost up to A——. Well, we hope when the dust is cleared away from your vision, that you have stirred up in *rising*, you will be able to see that you are no longer in the stagnant pool among the putrid waters where any move is hated and dreaded.

But, you were "*provoked* by the perusal" of the Six Sermons! We are sorry you could not keep your temper while reading them. But, the author "gives us logic, and criticism, and exposition with a vengeance." Indeed, friend Y.; and why did you not give just a little "logic, criticism, and exposition"? Probably because you had neither. You are excusable then, in that respect; but what excuse for exhausting such an "*extra stock of patience*" as you "*laid in* for the purpose of getting through these sermons"? Men are not apt to get out of a previously provided stock of patience if they have *argument*. As you have not given even the "*shade*" of an argument, we conclude you had none; and that explains the sudden deficiency of your large stock of patience. To help you in your trouble, however, you have made one appeal—heathen like—to the "*shade*" of a dead one. You would have shown more wisdom to have tried an appeal to his living testimony; though you would have appealed equally in vain. But, the Sermons are "such a mass of *ill-begotten reasoning, such a rabble of verbiage, such a mess of tinkum tankum*"! Hold, friend "Y"; don't quite exhaust the prolific fountain of your brain: the Baptist "Recorder" will need some new ideas next time you write.

We come now to an *oasis*. "The doctrine has abler defenders than Mr. Storrs." Praise the Lord for that. "But ** people go to hear *him*; and, as I learn, people of mind and intelligence." How astonishing that "such a mess of *tinkum tankum*" should attract "people of mind and intelligence"! Really, we do not wonder "Y's" "extra stock of patience" has run out. What next, friend Y.?—Why, "in the city of Paterson, where" this "tinkum tankum" man—"Storrs—has been lecturing *** three or four of the first men among the Methodists have embraced his views." Terrible! Invoke the "shade of Paul" again, "Y." Anything more to say? "The doctrine of annihilation has *plausible ground*." Indeed! We thought it was all "a rabble of verbiage," *etc!* What more? "Many good men have believed it." That's refreshing.—"*Good men* have believed it." Yea, "*many*" of them. Thank you, friend "Y." After all, we may prove to be *one* of those "many good men." Don't get "out of patience" with us then, lest you offend *one* of these little ones that believe in Jesus, who is *our life*.

But, says "Y." "It is folly to assert that the fear of annihilation will have more influence to deter men from sin than that of eternal torment. *Our instincts* teach the contrary."

Does the Bible "teach the contrary"? No. "*God is love*"—and the manifestation of that love in the gift of his Son, to give *life* to men, has more power over an unbrutalized mind than all the floods of hell torments ever preached.

———o———

Truth Advancing.—We have had occasion to remark before that the most reflecting and best informed among our opponents are yielding many points which have heretofore been strenuously maintained. A writer in the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, for April, 1852, admitted, that the "immortality of the soul cannot" be "proved" apart from the Bible,—that "neither the metaphysical nor the moral arguments in favor of its immortality amount to demonstration:" and he added—"Yet, *in the Bible*, we think, there is *no passage* which can be strictly said to declare that all human souls are immortal." He then admits that the whole ground of dispute between them and us is—"*Shall the wicked exist for ever in misery?*" This is narrowing down the controversy and lessening our work amazingly.

In the last Examiner, we gave admissions from Prof. Johnson, taken from the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, for January last. The April number of the same periodical contains a Review of the

"*Analytical Investigations concerning the Credibility of the Scriptures, and of the Religious System inculcated in them: together with a Historical Exhibition of Human Conduct during the several dispensations under which mankind have been placed by their Creator.* By J. H. M'Culloh, M.D., 2 vols., 8 vo. Baltimore, 1852."

The review is by Dr. T. E. Bond, Jr., Baltimore. He opens as follows:—

"Since the days of our Lord's personal ministry, his disciples have altered the shibboleth of Christianity. The test question is not now, '*Simon Peter, lovest thou me?*' but, '*Simon Peter, thinkest thou as I do?*' Unless the answer be clearly and decidedly affirmative, there is but cold welcome to the Master's vineyard—no excellence of piety is a sufficient offset to variant opinions, even about things the most abstruse and difficult of determination. No superiority of understanding compensates, in its admirable conclusions, for unlawful speculations upon subjects concerning which men have done little else than speculate from the beginnings of thought. 'Venerable Bede,' says John Newton, 'after giving a high character of some contemporary, adds, '*But, unhappy man, he did not keep Easter our way.*'"

"Dr. M'Culloh must expect similar treatment to that which has ever been meted out to men of his kind. None who read his book can doubt his piety, or his honest, earnest purpose to accomplish what he conscientiously believes to be the work which is given him to do. The book displays upon every page the single-mindedness of a Christian man, devoting uncommon intellectual powers to the attainment and dissemination of the truth. Yet the results of his investigations, as he has determined them, as a whole, are not in full accordance with the entire views of any one of the many Christian denominations, and consequently, whatever these may think of one another, they all will agree that our author is a heretic; for to be a heretic, is but to differ from themselves. It may be expected that clergymen, regularly trained in schools of divinity, will superciliously glance over the index, and pronounce the presumptuous layman a dangerous intermeddler with theological science; and that many good people, responding to the pastoral warning, will cry out '*Simon Magus*' as lustily as though they could comprehend the matter, or could of their own knowledge give a consistent statement of the plan of salvation, or any valid reason for their faith in the Scriptures."

Dr. Bond, after speaking of the offence Dr. McCulloh's work will give to different sects in religion, gives the following "golden precept" from John Wesley's writings:—

"Although every man necessarily believes that every particular opinion which he holds is true, (for to believe any opinion is not true is the same thing as not to hold it,) yet can no man be assured that all his own opinions, taken together, are true. Nay, every thinking man is assured they are not, seeing *humanum est errare et nescire*, to be ignorant of many things and to mistake in some is the necessary condition of humanity. This, therefore, he is sensible is his own case. He knows, in general, that he himself is mistaken, although in what particulars he mistakes he does not, perhaps he cannot, know."

Dr. Bond remarks, after this paragraph from Wesley, as follows:—

"If such be the case, (and who can doubt it, except the presumptuous man who, by doubting, proves himself a subject of the rule?) why should we form for ourselves a cast-iron theology, in which we must lie without the least liberty of motion, however pressed by its narrowness and galled by its inequalities? and why should we furiously resist the approaches of those who, whether able to do so or not, propose to make our bed more tolerable? God forbid that we should suppose it possible for us to be mistaken as to what He requires of men in order to their salvation, or that we should extend the hand of Christian fellowship to any one who may presume to teach things contrary to the positive declarations of Jehovah."

Dr. Bond then states, there are "doctrines clearly revealed," which are not "*opinions*," and not to be questioned. He adds:—

"But connected with these few absolute teachings are many inferences and extended applications and conjectural speculations and philosophical explications more or less important, but the notions of which need not interfere between a man and his God—may not impede repentance, nor faith, nor holiness. About these we hold *opinions*, but we hold them modestly, under the advice of Mr. Wesley, that 'as a whole they must be incomplete and erroneous;'—we hold them subject to instruction. We will reason about them, not quarrel for them. We are glad to compare them with the opinions of others, to correct them if we can, to make them a means of correction if we may, keeping always in view as a corrective to intemperate zeal another saying of Mr. Wesley: 'Without *holiness* no man shall see the Lord; but I dare not add, *without clear ideas*.'

"Unfortunately it is precisely of these *opinions* that we are apt to be most tenacious, valuing them in proportion to the difficulty we have in defending and retaining them."

We give the whole of what Dr. Bond says on Dr. M'Culloh's views of the resurrection of the dead and the destruction of the wicked. It is as follows:—

"With regard to the resurrection of the dead, Dr. M'Culloh adopts the views of Mr. Locke, which seem also to have been acceptable to Archbishop Whately. The doctrine is, that by the resurrection of *the dead* is not meant of the *dead body*, but only the revivification of dead persons, who remain in unconsciousness until the great and terrible day of the Lord. The argument as presented by our author contains a very full examination of the many passages of Scripture bearing upon this interesting point. It is, of course, impossible that we should follow him through his exposition. We will only comment upon one Greek criticism upon which the case mainly rests.

Dr. M'Culloh says:—

'The Scriptures say expressly, *The dead* shall be raised; but nowhere, that the *dead bodies* of men shall be raised. These terms are entirely different, and the distinction is clearly expressed in the Greek of the New Testament.....The Greek word for *the dead* is *nekros*, an adjective or part of speech which every one, acquainted even with English grammar, knows to be a word expressing a *quality, state* or *condition*. It is not a noun substantive, and as such by no propriety could be used as implying a *dead body*.'

"It would be enough, perhaps, to say in reply to this, that the *original* use of the word *nekros* was its substantive use, to denote *a dead body, a corpse,* (see Liddell & Scott, or Robinson, *sub voce,*) and that it was only in Attic and later usage that it was, in fact, to any extent, employed adjectively. But even admitting that the Scripture writers commonly speak of the resurrection of 'the dead,' using *nekros* adjectively, the expression seems to us perfectly natural and consistent with our present usage. We do not speak of the resurrection of *corpses* or of mere *animal remains* (*somata,*) but of *the dead*, because we do not believe that the body is to be revivified without reunion with the spirit and entire restoration of the person deceased. Had the apostles taught the resurrection of the '*soma*,' they would have left it in doubt whether the hope of the resurrection is confined to the human race, or is common to all the creatures subject to death. They would also have left it uncertain whether the reanimation of the body is to be merely a restoration to it of animal life, or a reunion with it of the moral and intellectual nature. We think they use the right word, and are well satisfied with the ordinary interpretation of it.

"Dr. M'Culloh is always strongest where he is most original. The valuable parts of his work are his own, the errors are commonly opinions and arguments adopted from others. Modestly confessing the imperfection of his classical learning, which however is very respectable, the doctor has confided too fully in the pretensions of great men. However, one can hardly lose much reputation by erring with John Locke.

"Dr. M'Culloh declares his decided approbation of the views of Macknight and others, that, after the final decisions of the judgment, the wicked will be utterly destroyed by a dreadful visitation of Almighty wrath. This question is to be determined in no other way than by the interpretation of the texts of Scripture which bear upon it. We have no right to argue it upon its consistency with the divine character on the one hand, nor the evil consequences which may be expected to follow its affirmation upon the other. It is a simple question of, What saith the Lord? and the answer must be found in the critical examination of the Greek text of the New Testament. Through such an examination it is impossible to follow our author. He offers no new argument in favor of his hypothesis, and we refer our readers for its refutation to the many writings upon the subject. There are several other points on which our author maintains opinions contrary to those commonly received; but we cannot find space to comment upon them. Our silence, however, must not be construed as assent."

We have not seen Dr. M'Culloh's work, and cannot therefore express an opinion of its merits: but judging from Dr. Bond's admissions, we think it must have considerable merit. Dr. Bond says—"Had the apostles taught the resurrection of the *soma* [*body*], they would have left it in doubt whether the hope of the resurrection is confined to the human race, or is common to all creatures subject to death. They would also," he adds, "have left it uncertain whether the reanimation of the body is to be *merely* a restoration to its *animal life*, or a reunion with it of the moral and intellectual nature."

This paragraph shows truth is advancing. Strange as it may seem, it is almost an assertion that the *body* may have *animal life without* a "moral and intellectual nature." So is immortal-soulism pressed with difficulty. And then, contrary to Scripture, Dr. Bond speaks of the "*reunion*" of body and spirit. The making alive the dead is not a *reunion* of body and soul, but a making alive *the man*—"I will raise *him* up at the last day"—saith Jesus: *not*, I will *reunite* body and soul, or spirit. "How are *the dead* raised up, and with what body do *they* come?" It is not a *living* man reunited to a body, but the *dead man himself*, that is raised up from "*the dust of the earth.*" And the intelligent mind of Dr. Bond, we are persuaded, will yet see this truth. We are more encouraged to hope he will from the fact that he says, on the subject of the final state of the wicked—"It is a simple question of, What saith the Lord? and the answer must be found in the critical examination of the Greek text of the New Testament." Yes, and he might have added, of the *Hebrew* text of the Old Testament. Out of the mouth of these "*two witnesses* every word shall be established." These are harmonious that death is a state of *total silence*, and that "all the wicked will God destroy"—yea, "*annihilate.*"

Dr. Spring, of this city, once closed a discourse in the following language, which, tho' not *intended*, possibly, to teach the unconsciousness of man in death, is so truthful and scriptural that we give it place here as evidence where thinking men find themselves in spite of their creeds. He said:—

"We die; but intervening ages pass rapidly over those who sleep in the dust. There is no plate there on which to count the hours of time. No longer is it to be told by days, or months, or years; for the planets which mark these periods are hidden from their sight. Its flight is no longer noticed by the events perceived by the senses, for the ear is deaf and the eye is closed. The busy world of life, which wakes at each morning, and ceases every night, goes on above them, but to them all is silent and unseen. The greetings of joy and the voice of grief, the revolution of Empires and the lapse of ages, send no sound within that narrow cell. Generation after generation are brought and laid by their side: the inscription upon their marble tells the centuries that have passed away; but to the sleeping dead, the long interval is unobserved. Like the dream of a night, with the quickness of thought, the mind ranges time and space almost without limit. There is but a moment between the hour when the eye is closed in the grave and when it wakes to the judgment."

Let all the friends of truth take courage. We shall not labor in vain, nor spend our strength for

nought. The age has come that every man's theological works are to be tried by fire. The wood, hay, and stubble, are to be burned; and such as have built therewith will suffer loss. Some, we fear, will perish with their works, like the Jews of old; but many, we trust, will rejoice when they find the fire has consumed their old theological *rubbish*. Then, if they love God—as we know many of them do, who have for more than "*eighteen years*" been "*bound*" in a corrupt theology—then, when delivered, will they sing as in their first love. May the Lord hasten the deliverance.

———o———

THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

BY THE EDITOR.

This parable has been insisted upon as proof of the conscious state of men in death, and of eternal torments to the wicked; but we believe it affords no evidence of either. If it could be demonstrated to be a *history*, and not a parable, it would not prove that wicked men are to be endlessly tormented; because the scene is laid immediately after death and *before* the judgment; hence, is not *the* punishment which *follows* judgment: that punishment may be death or literal annihilation for all this case teaches. But the whole is a parable; and this fact is so notorious that scarcely any commentator, or any intelligent writer, pretends to question it. To call it a "*literal history*," in these days, is to manifest fixed bigotry, profound ignorance, or willful opposition to clearly settled truth. We shall therefore occupy no space in proving it a parable, but proceed at once to its exposition.

Parables are never given to teach doctrine, but to illustrate some truth already partially known or about to be announced; and no parable is ever to be interpreted on the principle that every item contained in it was designed to have an application. Bishop Lowth says—"Parable is that kind of allegory which consists of a continued narration of *fictitious* or accommodated events applied to the illustration of some important truth." The *scope* and design of a parable is all we need to concern ourselves about; and to attempt a particular application of every expression in it is to enter the field of speculation where the most fanciful will be the most successful in turning off eyes from the real design of him who spake the parable.

The *key* to a parable is either in the parable itself or in the discourse connected with it. In the case before us it is in the context. The *scope*, or design of the parable was to teach the effect to follow upon *two classes of men* by a change from the Mosaic, or Law-dispensation to the Christian, or Gospel dispensation. This fact is clearly set forth in the 17th verse, which is the *key* to the parable, and unlocks it perfectly. That verse reads thus —"The law and the prophets were" [preached] "until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached." That is, a new dispensation of God's favor is now opened; no longer to be confined to the Jews, or *one* nation, but to embrace "all nations" in its offered benefits. This change would affect very differently two different classes of men; viz., the Jews, who were under the law, and the Gentiles, who are to be embraced under the gospel, or to be made partakers of those peculiar blessings which had been hitherto so exclusively confined to the *sons* of Abraham. The effects of this change are illustrated by the parable under consideration. The parties concerned and to be affected are distinctly marked. The items relating to the rich man clearly mark him as the representative of the Jews, as a people. We note his case first. *His dress.* He was "clothed in *purple and fine linen.*" Now turn to "*the law*" that was "*until John,*" and see what was the clothing of the priests under that law. See Exodus 28; where Moses was commanded to make for Aaron and the other priests "garments for glory and beauty." Verses 5, 6, 8, and 15—"And they shall take gold, and blue, and *purple*, and scarlet, and *fine linen.*—And they shall make the ephod of gold, blue, and *purple*, scarlet, and *fine* twined *linen.* ** And thou shalt make the breast-plate * * of *purple* * * and *fine twined linen.*" Such were the peculiarities of the dress, or *clothing* of these *representatives* of the law and the Mosaic dispensation, or Jewish system. These peculiarities our Lord commences with in his description of the rich man; and they are sufficiently striking to satisfy the unprejudiced inquirer after truth that the Jews, nationally, were to be represented by the rich man in the parable. The Jews were *rich* in those abundant communications of truth, knowledge, and peculiar privileges which God had endowed them with by direct communications, or through the prophets whom he had raised up to instruct them from time to time, till at length he spake unto them "*by his Son.*" Rich were they, indeed, in these high and exalted advantages over all other nations and people. It were easy to enlarge here, but we study brevity. The period of their exclusive enjoyment of those peculiarities was their "*life-time:*" but the time came that those peculiarities were to pass away; and that period is represented as a *death.* It was the death of their whole ecclesiastical polity—it was now to be superseded by a more spiritual and universal system, embracing other people: the "*life-time*" of their peculiarities is ended—the change has come over them, symbolized by a death and burial. Where next is this once rich man found? Is it in the *theological hell*? No: it is not even in *Gehenna;* but, in *Hades.* The former term, only, is used to denote the punishment of wicked men; while *hades* signifies *covered*, or the state of death. It is the word in Greek exactly corresponding with *sheol* in Hebrew: a state of which it is affirmed, there is *no knowledge* there, (See Ecc. 9: 5, 10:) hence the term is used figuratively in this parable, and does not apply to *a person* really dead, but to a state of deprivation and affliction: [See the terms *Gehenna*, *Sheol*, and *Hades*, fully explained in "Bible vs. Tradition."]

The rich man is alive after his ecclesiastical death; but is stript of all his peculiarities and reduced to a state of wretchedness and torment. And does not the history of the Jews, as a people, from the overthrow of their temple, city, and sacrifices there, unto this day, or present century, fully justify the parabolical description given by our Lord of the misery to which they would be subjected under

the new dispensation which was to follow theirs? No one can doubt this who has any knowledge of their history for the last eighteen hundred years: and if we have not understanding of their history, read the prophecies of the judgments threatened them, Lev. 26th and Deut. 28th chapters, and "be no longer faithless but believing." "Wrath has come upon them to the uttermost." 1 Thess. 2: 16. And Jesus said, relative to the overthrow of their city and the tribulation to attend and follow that event—"These be the days of vengeance that ALL THINGS *which are written may be fulfilled.*" Lk. 21: 22.

Since the ecclesiastical and national death of the Jews—the rich man—there has been a claim maintained among them that "Abraham" is their "father;" but no relief has come to them from that quarter.

The desire expressed by the rich man, that further light or information should be given to convince the nation or people of Jews, by a resurrection of one from the dead, is met, in the parable, by showing that no further information would avail with those who had rejected all the previous light God had given them: and the answer—"neither will they be persuaded though *one rose* from the dead,"—was shown to be true by the conduct of "the chief priests and pharisees," when Jesus actually raised *a* "*Lazarus*" from the dead, [John 11th,] they called a "council," and "from that day forth took counsel together for to put Jesus to death." How true that they would not "be persuaded though one rose from the dead;" and after they had accomplished their bloody purpose, and put Christ to death, and he also had been raised from the dead, under such circumstances that there was no chance to doubt the fact, the same obstinate unbelief remained; and they gave large sums of money to the soldiers to tell the most silly and improbable *lie* that was ever invented; viz., That the disciples of Jesus came by night and stole Jesus away while they slept!!

Thus the parable, so far as the rich man is concerned, has a fair and full application, and illustrates the obstinate unbelief and consequent misery and torment of that people, after their final refusal to receive Jesus as the Messiah.

It only remains now briefly to consider that part of the parable relating to the poor man, or Lazarus. Prior to the change in the dispensations, from the Mosaic to the Christian, the Gentiles were poor indeed in religious knowledge, and excluded from the *peculiar* privileges of the Jews—the rich man.—They could only approach the "*outer court*"—or "gate"—of the Temple service: where some of them sought the "*crumbs*" of knowledge which might better their condition. Still their general condition in regard to divine "things" was "evil." The time at length arrives when they are no longer to remain in this condition, and that change—to keep up the harmony of the parable—is represented by a death. They pass out of their previous state and find themselves in "Abraham's bosom"—*partakers in that covenant* God made with Abraham; for, "If ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Gal. 3: 29. To this honor they are brought through the ministration of angels—*aggellon—messengers.* Christ gave his *messengers* commission to "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature."—Under this commission they brought many Gentiles into the Abrahamic covenant; for, The Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen [the Gentiles,] through faith, preached before *the gospel* unto Abraham, saying, "In thee shall all nations be blessed." Gal. 3: 8. And the apostle adds—"So then they which be of faith *are blessed with* faithful Abraham:" they are in "Abraham's bosom:" a phrase which imports a partaker of his blessings and being in the same covenant relation to God. In this condition are all believing Gentiles, and are now "*comforted;*" while the obstinate unbelieving Jew from the time of Christ, or from the introduction of the Christian dispensation, has been "*tormented:*" and the "*gulf*" between the two dispensations is "*impassable*"—they cannot be joined in one: to come into the blessings of the Christian dispensation is impossible to any one still cleaving to the Mosaic for justification; and to return from the Christian to the Mosaic is to "fall from grace," and to be swallowed up in the gulf.

We might greatly enlarge the proof that the foregoing is the true scope and design of the parable; but we believe enough has been said to satisfy the candid inquirer after truth, and we have no expectation that obstinate bigotry will be removed, even tho' another Lazarus should arise from the dead and affirm the truth of the exposition we have here given.

STRICTURES.

BRO. STORRS:—It is desirable for the sake both of truth and charity, that we should be careful how we write of those things the Lord has graciously taught us by his Word and Spirit, which many of our beloved brethren in Christ do not yet understand. Certainly their prejudice is sufficiently strong without any increasing it unnecessarily, by magnifying the comparative importance of our peculiar views to the violation of Christian truth and love.

I have no disposition to detract an iota from the scriptural importance of the gracious and glorious doctrine of LIFE IN CHRIST ALONE; or that Immortality is not an attribute of human nature, but the "gift of God" through his beloved Son our Saviour. I must however meekly, but earnestly, protest against rending the "one body" of the Lord Jesus, by making the knowledge of this particular truth essential to salvation, as a brother has done in the last Examiner, in the following language:—"To attain this salvation, even through the mighty aid of a gracious Redeemer, it is all-important, nay *absolutely* necessary, that he, *Man*, have a proper and *just estimate* of what he *really is*—both by birth and nature. As long as we think ourselves of an immortal nature by birth—we cannot possibly cultivate a true and earnest desire to attain salvation through Jesus Christ alone."

If our brother had only affirmed that Christians, who hold the fable of natural immortality, cannot have a true idea of our obtaining eternal life, or salvation from the second death, "through Jesus Christ alone," he would have affirmed an important truth. But what he has written consigns to eternal perdition those who have not only had an "earnest desire to attain salvation through Jesus Christ alone," but have borne the cross after him, loving him to the death, and sealing their holy testimony for his truth with their blood.

That "the belief in our natural immortality, creates a carelessness about committing sin," when such belief has induced the belief of universal salvation, may indeed be true *in respect to ungrateful sinners*. The error could not produce such an effect in a holy mind.

Our brother farther remarks:—"It is palpably evident to any mind that is endowed with the slightest degree of *reflection*, or the smallest perception of *right* and *wrong*, that a God of INFINITE, unbounded, unending LOVE, would never punish with eternal *torture* or *misery*, any of his creatures, not to say his children, for the sins of a life time." Now that this horrible dogma is a gross perversion of the glorious truth of God, and highly dishonorable to every divine attribute, I verily believe; but that when I preached it, or when thousands of others preached it, we had not the *slightest* degree of reflection, or the *smallest* perception of *right* and *wrong*, is hardly admissible.

Still more objectionable is the remark, "This belief in innate immortality, I take to be the basis of all that hardness of heart, that keeps man from God, the true cause of that blindness which veils the plainest truths of the gospel in impenetrable darkness to the great mass of mankind."

It is indeed true that this erroneous faith is the cause of blindness in respect to the true penalty of God's law, the real desert of sin, and future punishment, as well as in reference to the great and glorious fact, that we have LIFE ONLY in the Son of the Blessed; but to say that it is "the basis of all that hardness of heart that keeps man from God" is an unwarrantable exaggeration. It is to say, either, that among all the millions that have believed it, there has not been a single real Christian, or that after a man is born of God and renewed in his inmost mind by the Holy Spirit, "the basis of hardness of heart, which keeps man from God," remains!

"Above all these things (let us) put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness."

Fraternally yours, HENRY GREW.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—In the stricture of Br. Grew on the phrase, "*absolutely* necessary," we fully concur. We overlooked it when inserted, or we should certainly have stricken it out. We have had so many cares upon us, and so much traveling to perform during the winter, that we have hardly been able to keep that look out that an editor ought to do.

The second point in the strictures would have been uncalled for, had the writer, referred to, have simply added—"where the truth on the subject has been presented." That was, doubtless, his meaning. So we understood him.

The last point in the strictures would also have been uncalled for, if the word "*all*" had been exchanged for *much*, or *most* of; and the words, "*the true* cause," for the *main* cause. With these amendments we should fully endorse the sentiments expressed by the brother whose remarks occasioned Br. Grew's strictures—in the spirit of which we harmonize.

THOUGHTS ON JOHN, XI. 25—26.

"I am the Resurrection and the Life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead yet shall he live; and whosever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die."

This text has sometimes been quoted to prove that there is a life for man immediately after dissolution in a separate or disembodied soul-state. Now, it should be observed that whatever this text teaches, concerns exclusively the *believer* in Christ. The benefit, whatever this is, concerns only him "*that believeth in me;*" so that if it teaches that there is a disembodied soul-state between the time of death and resurrection—it implies that the *believer* will have such an intermediate state of life, and the believer *only;* and that the state of unbelievers in this interval is one of unconsciousness and absolute decease. This text can be no support, on the contrary it is an implied denial, of the popular doctrines of the soul's constitutional immortality, and separate state between death and resurrection.

We submit the following as a true exposition of the text.

1. Our Lord makes a statement concerning *the believer who is* DEAD, and the statement is, that *he shall live, or rise again*—"he that believeth in me, *though he were dead* yet shall he live."

2. Our Lord makes a statement concerning *every believer who may* NOT BE DEAD, but may be *living at the time of his coming*, and the statement is that all such shall *never die at all;*—"whosoever *liveth*, and believeth in me, shall *never die.*"

Here are two distinct statements, which are briefly as follows:

1. The *dead* in Christ at the time of Christ's coming, *shall rise again.*

2. The *living* in Christ at the time of Christ's coming *shall never die.*

And these two statements correspond respectively with the introductory declarations "I am the Resurrection and the Life." This is not to be regarded as the repetition of one idea, but as two distinct ideas. If our Lord had said only, "I am the Resurrection," or only, "I am the Life," he would not have expressed his full adaptation to the necessities of his Church,—for some will be *asleep* "in the dust of the earth," and will need a *resurrection:* and some will not be dead, but *alive* on the earth, and will need, not a resurrection, but to be immortalized or made partakers of the *everlasting life.* "I am the Resurrection," says our Lord, and therefore "he that believeth in me, *though he were dead* yet shall he live" by resurrection. And "I am the Life" also, therefore "whosoever *liveth* and believeth in me *shall never die*," but being alive at the time of my coming, shall undergo that change which is necessary to be made a possessor of immortal life. "Behold I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and *the dead shall be raised incorruptible*, and *we* (who may be living on the earth) shall be *changed.* For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."—1 COR. xv. 51—53.

J. Panton Ham, Bristol, England.

"ÆTERNITAS."—The remainder of this article, by Br. Moncrieff, commenced in the Examiner for March, has never been received.

———o———

"A HISTORY OF THE PRESENT POPULAR OPINIONS CONCERNING THE DOCTRINE OF HUMAN IMMORTALITY, by *J. Panton Ham.*"—This number of the Examiner contains the remainder of that interesting article under the head of "*Historical Inquiry.*" We have also put it—slightly abridged—in the "*Appendix*" to the "*Bible vs. Tradition;*" believing it to be a valuable addition to the work. We have thought of issuing it in a Pamphlet of 24 pages, 12 mo., with covers. In that case, the price would be from three to four dollars per hundred.—We shall not do it, however, unless we have pledges for at least one thousand copies.

———o———

"THE SCRIPTURES *able to make us wise unto Salvation;* or, THE BIBLE A SUFFICIENT CREED." Such is the title of a pamphlet of 24 pages, 12 mo., "*by F. H. Berrick*, Lowell, Mass." It shows, in their true light, the wickedness of creeds and creed-makers. Tho' we may not endorse every expression in it, we hope it will be read and pondered well by all. For sale by *the author*, and at Second Advent Watchman office, Hartford, Conn. Price *eight* cents single; $5 per 100, with covers; $3 without.

———o———

NOTICES.—Frederick Bailey—Money never received. Papers sent. Thomas Smith—Absent from home till too late, and have sent to Eddington.

Dr. John Howell's Post-office address is, West Winsted, Conn.

Eld. Wm. Ongley's Post-office address is, New Castle, Canada West.

———o———

☞ WE have been delayed by the "*May-day movings*" of New-York, in issuing the Examiner, so that it appears late this month. By this means we are enabled to announce that the long-expected work—"*Bible vs. Tradition*"—is printed and in the hands of the binder. Those, therefore, who have *paid* their *pledges* may look for it in four or five days. Where one or two copies only are to be sent it will be *by mail.* More than that number, to one address, will be sent *by Express.* All persons who have paid $1 for *one* copy, will find the *postage paid.* If in any case the work is not received in a week or ten days, or if the postage is not paid let us know.

We are persuaded no person will regret the expense of a copy of this work. It may have its defects, and we do not endorse every sentiment it contains; yet, as a whole, it is the most valuable work that has been published on the subject, in our opinion. Let there be no delay in scattering it.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &C., &C.

FOR SALE AT

BIBLE EXAMINER OFFICE.

140 FULTON STREET, NEW-YORK.

Postage can be pre-paid, or paid on *delivery*, as the purchaser may choose. Works not weighing over 3 oz. can be sent to any part of the United States for one cent, if pre-paid, or two cents if paid on delivery. Books bound, or unbound, one cent per oz. under 3000 miles: one-half cent to be added if not pre-paid.—Tracts half cent per oz. if sent in packages of not less than *eight ounces*, otherwise subject to same postage as three oz. pamphlets, each.

1. SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT, by H. H. Dobney," Baptist minister; an argument in *two parts.* This is a work of great power, showing the *Righteous only will live Forever*, 286 pages. Price 50 cts. bound. Weight 13 oz. In paper covers 37 1-2 cts: wgt. 9 oz.

2. "DOBNEY ABRIDGED."—Or, the *Second Part* of the Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment, in an edition by itself. It contains all that is really essential in the controversy, to enable the reader to decide whether *endless torture*, or *destruction of being*, is the true teaching of Scripture. We put it at the extremely low price of 25 cents, in paper covers. Wgt. 6 oz.

3. "THE UNITY OF MAN, OR LIFE AND DEATH REALITIES.—A Reply to Rev. Luther Lee, by Anthropos." This is a thorough refutation of Mr. Lee's position of the natural immortality of man. Price 15 cents.—Weight 3 oz.

4. "SIX SERMONS, by Geo. Storrs. An inquiry, *Are the Wicked Immortal?*' To which is *added* a dissertation on the "State of the Dead;" and *prefixed* Archbishop Whately's remarks on the "The Second Death." Price 15 cents. Weight 3 oz.

5. "STORRS' MISCELLANY."—It contains the foregoing Nos. 4 and 5, with a variety of other matter, bound. Price 50 cents. Wgt. 9 oz.

6. "THE GENERATIONS GATHERED AND GATHERING; or, *The Scripture Doctrine of Man in Death.* By J. Panton Ham," Congregational minister, England.—Price 10 cents. Weight 2 oz.

7. "LIFE AND DEATH; or, *The Theology of the Bible in Relation to Human Immortality.* Three Lectures, by J. Panton Ham." A most interesting work in connection with his other, above named. Price and weight same as the other.

8. "BIBLE VS. TRADITION—*In which the* TRUE TEACHING OF THE BIBLE IS MANIFESTED,—*The corruptions of Theologians detected—and the Traditions of men Exposed*: By ELLIS & READ." This work should have a wide circulation. It is what its title imports; and will be found a mighty weapon, through God, to the pulling down the strong hold of inherent immortality in man; that fable which has so long corrupted the Word of God. Price 75 cts. Weight about 16 oz.

On the foregoing works one-third discount will be made, for cash, to wholesale purchasers.

9. BIBLE EXAMINER for '50 and '51, bound in one vol. Price $1.50. Also in *sheets* for '49, '50, and '51. Price 50 cents for each year: and for '52, price 75 cents.

10. "BIBLE EXAMINER, EXTRA."—New Edition. It contains Bishop Whately's remarks on "Second Death"—"Endless Misery," by Bishop Newton—Our "Six Sermons," &c., 16 pages, quarto, and sold at the extreme low price of $2·50 per 100, or 5 cts. single copy. Wgt. 2 oz.

A variety of Tracts also can be had of us on the foregoing topics. All orders and communications must be addressed, GEO. STORRS, *New-York.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VIII. NEW YORK, JUNE, 1853. NO. 6.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 140 Fulton-street, (Up Stairs.)

TERMS.--Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

ÆTERNITAS REVIEWED.

BY REV. WM. G. MONCRIEFF.

"ÆTERNITAS: *or, Glimpses of the Future Destinies of Man:* By Wm. Bathgate."

Continued from page 35.

We design on this occasion to consider Mr. Bathgate's doctrine of the human soul: and concerning the soul we read:—

"The human soul is an entity, a being, *distinct* from the mortal or fleshly part of man. Each day testifies that our earthly life is but a vapor, a dream, a shadow. Unless it can be proved that the soul is an existence distinct from organized bones and flesh, and blood, neither the possibility nor probability of the immortality of mind could be established. Were it not a *separate* existence, then it could never be a *subsequent* existence. It might be the former without being the latter, but it could never be the latter without being the former.—Daily we see human bodies mixing with kindred dust. If there be nothing more in man but flesh and blood, then his entire mortality is settled. But is not every human being *conscious* of a living something within, which moves the limbs and yet is not the limbs—which dictates to the foot, the hand, the tongue, and yet is none of these, though it has the command of all? In the meantime call it by what name you choose, only recognize its veritable distinct existence. Should it be hastily observed, that this vital principle, this living entity, is so incorporated with the human frame, that it necessarily expires when its tenement is rent and shivered, the answer is that it has yet to be proved. The very language used, grants, at all events, that the living entity is not the human frame; and he raves rather than reasons, who asserts that things joined together for a season, must all expire on being separated. All we now ask of the reader, is the remembrance of the important circumstance, that all the world over, human consciousness testifies that there is something more in man than bones, and flesh, and blood. This additional something may or may not have a *subsequent* existence, may or may not have an *immortal* existence, but that it has a *veritable* present existence is undeniable. This fact, though indispensable as a stepping-stone to the probability we wish to establish, is yet no argument on the question.

"This distinct something, of the existence of which all men are conscious, is *immaterial.* The body is matter. The soul has none of the properties by which matter is distinguished. It cannot be seen, touched, measured, or weighed. It is, in the present economy, dependent on the body for a residence, but is no more to be confounded or identified with it, than the wayfarer is to be identified with the inn which affords him a lodging for the night." p. p. 42, 44.

After the reader has perused this long extract, we would ask him, as a starting query, is there not a great amount of confusion and indefiniteness in it? We read of "the human soul," and what is that?—It is a living something within every human being of which he is conscious, and yet whether it is the thing that has self-consciousness we are not informed,—it is a vital principle, and yet a living entity;—it is no more to be confounded with the body than the wayfarer is to be identified with the inn which affords him a night's lodging,—it is within man, a part of him, and after all it is the man himself, residing in a tenement of clay. This is confusion worse confounded. Had the Sphinx propounded a riddle like this, she would have been sure of immortality. In place of this long array of words, it would have been far better had the author at once told us, he understood the soul to be THE MAN,—the body his house, and that at present man, the immaterial being, is dwelling in a material fabric, like a hermit in his cave. We almost every day meet with the expression, the soul, not the body, is the man; and our author is one of the great throng who approve and endorse such assertions. The soul being the man, it, or rather *he,* is held to be capable of existing apart from organization, nay, is commonly supposed to be benefited by the expulsion which occurs at death; at any rate he is, on the common theory, held to think and remember, love and hate, joy and suffer, as perfectly after as before that crisis in the progress of his being. Bearing these things in mind, let us throw the passage into the following form, and while it is a fair conversion, does not every mind see that the popular dogmas only become the more absurd the more we try to give them intelligibility,—"The human soul, that is, a man, is an entity, a being, distinct from the mortal or fleshly part of man.—Each day testifies that our earthly life, or the earthly life of each soul, is but a vapor, a dream, a shadow. Unless it can be proved that the soul, i. e., the man, is an existence distinct from organized bones, and flesh, and blood, neither the possibility nor probability of the immortality of mind, that is, of soul, or of man, could be established." And over-leaping a few sentences, let us continue: "This distinct something, i. e., the soul, which is the man, of the existence of whom all men are conscious, is *immaterial.* The body is matter. The soul, i. e., the man, has none of the properties by which matter is distinguished, though we have previously said the fleshly *part* is a portion of man. It, or rather he,

cannot be seen, touched, measured, or weighed. He is, in the present economy, dependent on the body for a residence, but is no more to be confounded or identified with it, than the wayfarer is to be identified with the inn which affords him a lodging for a night." Thus the confusion, if possible, increases; the irreconcilable contradictions become more apparent. Nothing else could be expected, however, when the whole is based on a palpable misapprehension of scriptural truth, and this we shall endeavor to prove ere long.

We now proceed to examine the argument from consciousness for the distinct existence of the soul; that is, that the man himself is distinct from his members, or more accurately, from his corporeal instrumentality and habitation. Our author asks,—"Is not every human being *conscious* of a living something within, which moves the limbs, and yet is not the limbs, which dictates to the foot, the hand, the tongue, and yet is none of these, though it has the command of all?" The soul being pronounced the living entity—the human being—we are at a loss to determine what or where the "within" is, in which, it is affirmed, every man is conscious this "living something" exists. Is the "living something" different from each human being? Or does each human being have a living something within himself, so that he does not live save by having this living something within him, like a fire in a room? Has the human being the power to be conscious of this "living something" within him in virtue of a self-possessed life, or in virtue of this "living something" within him? If the human being is conscious of the "living something," is the same something conscious of him? Or have they mutual consciousness, so that we have substantially two men inwardly residing in the fleshly fabric, after the manner of the well-known Chinese puzzle-box?—Then, again, if this "living something" is just the same as the "human being" himself, the whole mystery would seem to be reducible to this simple truth, that every human being is *conscious of being alive*. and *of having capacity to move his limbs according to his own pleasure*. On the contrary, if the "human being" is not the same as this "living something," it will fail to be explained by whomsoever is able, what this "something" is, and how it happens that a living being like man, or, if other language be preferred, how it happens that a soul can hold a "living something" within itself. and of what need there is of such a something, since it is supposed the soul has a life of its own, and depends entirely on God for vitality, and not on any secondary fountain, much less one within the compass of its own being.

We have carried out these ideas and difficulties to this extent, just to show what the consciousness spoken of, in the volume before us, must be. It is incorrect to say, even on the author's own philosophy, that we are conscious of a "living something within," that is, within ourselves, for nothing can live within a soul, and the body cannot be conscious of its mystic inhabitant. He should have added, not that man is conscious of a something living within, using his hands, and eyes, but that as a being having life, and endowed with hands and other members, and powers, he is conscious of calling them into operation and ruling their movements.

Is it true we are conscious our hands, our eyes, our ears,—in a word, the visible organization, forms no part of us? We are not conscious of ever having been without this organization. This consciousness may be a product of false teaching, for men can easily get a consciousness of what they are taught they should be conscious of. The limits to the consequence of false education are like those of space, immeasurable and confounding. May not this consciousness be one form of the many deceptions wrought upon men regarding themselves?—We believe it, and the sooner it is torn in pieces the better.

What is here confined to the bodily organs, may be applied with no less effect to the mental powers, and the moment the application is made, the deception becomes apparent. Let us read the sentence thus—"Is not every human being conscious of a living something within, which moves his faculties, and is not the faculties,—which dictates to the will, the reason, the memory, the calculating power, and the music power, and yet is none of these, though it has the command of all? The consciousness that teaches what our author affirms in his text, no less delivers what is affirmed in our alteration of his words. When so interpreted both consciousnesses are false. We are conscious of powers, but to affirm that we are conscious these powers and members are none of us, would be contrary to fact properly interpreted, and would indeed involve its own refutation, inasmuch as it is by some of these very powers that we are able to have consciousness at all.

This description, so anxiously laid hold on to sustain the prevailing opinions about man, originates in a misunderstanding of the necessities we are under, obliging us to employ the current phraseology when speaking of ourselves and of our diversified powers. Man is a being having self-consciousness, and owning property in himself, and of course, in all the powers that go to form the complex idea *himself*. Hence we are required to use the terminology referred to. For instance, *my-self*, is *me* claiming property in *self*, the same *me;* the "my," is not different from the "*self*," but the same being clasping himself as his own and not another's. And so my hands, my feet, my tongue, my reason, my conscience, my will, and the like, is just a being claiming his powers and members as his own, and without these he would be no being at all. He is them, they are him. The foot is at the command of the man to whom it belongs, so is his eye, his tongue, his reason, his wit, and his volition; they are his, and, along with the other parts and functions, go to form *him*, instead of being things or powers, which are as different from him who claimed them, as the tools of a mechanic are from their owner, or the spurs of a rider from their user. This is what reason teaches, and it will be shown speedily that Scripture fully accords with its voice.

Once more, and then we leave this point; it has often been said the language, *my* hands, *my* feet, *my* arms, &c., all prove that the owner of these is totally distinct from all of them. Then comes the question, to whom do they all belong? and the triumphant reply sounds forth, to the soul, to the soul! The point is of great moment, and we bid the reader study it carefully. If possible to make it plainer, let it be remarked, that according to this

view, the antecedent to the "my" in the phrase "my hands" is the lordly soul, and so in all the other expressions we have mentioned, and as long as there is a member or part that claims to be taken into the enumeration. So be it, now mark the question that follows. In the expression "*my* soul," which we need not say is a common one and a scriptural one, which is the antecedent to the "*my?*" Is it a soul within the soul? Is it that "living something" which CRIES for explanation? In the phrase "*my* soul," or soul belonging to *me*, the *me* is just the soul speaking of itself, because, even on the popular idea concerning the soul, nothing about a man is *him* except his soul, and it would be gross ignorance were any one by *me* to indicate anything except himself. "My soul," then, is just a soul affirming self-possession; or a man realizing the idea and giving it expression, that under God, he belongs to himself, and may act as he pleases. Suppose a watch to become miraculously animated and endowed with articulate speech, it might speak thus, *my* wheels, *my* chain, *my* dial, *my* spring, *my* hands, *my* case. The *my* however is in fact the watch endowed with life and speech; it embraces all the parts completing *itself*, and what is a watch without wheels, and chain, and dial, and spring, and hands, and case? The watch in this instance simply would express property in itself; and so man declares himself to belong to himself, or his soul announces itself owner of itself, in the phraseology "*myself*" and "*my soul.*"

Hitherto we have not disturbed our author's assumption regarding "the human soul," and, as in many other cases in philosophy and theology, they are made with singular calmness and self-complacency. They run thus:—"the human soul is an entity, a being *distinct* from the mortal or fleshly part of man"—and again, "this distinct something, of the existence of which all men are conscious, is *immaterial.* The body is matter. The soul has none of the properties by which matter is distinguished. It cannot be seen, touched, measured, or weighed." Here are statements put down just as if they were as clear and self-evident as that two halves make a whole, or that things which are equal to the same thing are equal to one another. One would have expected some evidence of all these affirmations, and if they are just equal in value to unproved, it may be undemonstrable, statements, any one may rise up and flatly contradict them, and his assertion will be of the same worth as the author's. They would balance one another, and who shall find fault with our imaginary opponent when the liberty of making affirmation is equal? The volume says, "the soul is immaterial;" the opponent cries no, it is material;—it cannot be seen, the book testifies; but it can, says the opponent, and he adds, yea touched, and measured, and weighed too. So here we are at rest, and who will send us with brave force in that direction of truth! Who shall explain the awful problem—WHAT IS A SOUL? Who shall dissipate the thick darkness by kindling a sun-lamp in this chamber where we find ourselves not knowing what is around, and above and beneath; where only two voices are heard, the one affirming the soul is this, and the other flatly contradicting all that is spoken?

(*To be Continued.*)

THE LIGHT OF LIFE.

AN EXPOSITION OF ISAIAH IX. 2, 6.

"The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light: they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined...For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given."

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM.

To understand the rapt utterances of the Hebrew prophets, more particularly of Isaiah, we must, as it were, appropriate their peculiar consciousness—pass into that mental state in which they were when their lips poured forth the inspired thoughts which the Spirit of God kindled within them. The mood, if not the mode, of inspiration may be partially understood by the form which the prophetic utterances sometimes take. Before the mental eye of the seer, when under the divine afflatus or impulse, a vision seems to have been presented of the nature sometimes of a scenic representation. Its diversified imagery are foreshadows of the future, and as the prophet gazes on these apparant realities, he proclaims what he sees, as events then occurring, with that graphic grandeur of speech which the peculiarity of the revelation naturally inspires. It seems necessary to imagine the prophet Isaiah in this particular mental mood when he uttered or penned our text. His eye rests upon a vision of Northern Palestine—"Galilee of the nations." But it is a vision of "*darkness.*" In the deep recesses of a bleak barren valley, over which "darkness" broods, he sees "Galilee of the nations," and this "darkness" is described as "the *shadow* of death," fit emblem of the "darkness," the still deeper darkness of death itself. Death claims that gloomy valley as his own—it is the grim border land of the dark demon's territory. It is called, "the land of the *shadow* of death," and "the valley of the *shadow* of death," because it is in the near neighborhood of the dark and dreadful capital where Death himself reigns in absolute and eternal sway. There "people dwell," and walk in "darkness," for even the "shadow" of death is darkness, though a darkness which may be dispersed. This "valley," though under the dominion of death, is not so fully incorporated with his empire as to be unredeemable. As border land it is not so completely under his ebon rule. The "shadow," not the absolute substance of death, is there, hence there is redemption from the land of the *shadow* of death." While penetrating with more than human vision this thick "darkness"—this shade of grim death—and marking the wretchedness and horrible gloom of that dwelling-place of the people, suddenly the darkness begins to fold itself up like a thick black pall, and roll off the face of these gloomy homes. A "light" has broken upon the dreary solitudes of Galilee, and the upward turned faces of the people express their common and heartfelt joy. It is at this moment of time that the prophet speaks,—"The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light," or as Luther has it—"See a great light, &c.,.....for unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given."

Under the image of a *light*, a "*great light*," breaking upon darkness spread over Galilee, does the prophet describe the *birth of Christ*—the

child born—the son given. This "child," this "son," or Christ, is the "great light."

The prophet speaks of Galilee, not because Galilee was exclusively "the land of darkness and the shadow of death;" but because it was in that particular spot of the world's universal darkness that the "light" first dawned. Galilee was the home of Christ, and the scene of his first and principal public labors. (Matt. 4: 13–17.) And while we are not to restrict the "darkness" to Galilee, although this particular province of Palestine is specially mentioned, neither are we to conclude that Christ was a "light" exclusively to the Galileans. Others "sat in darkness" besides "Galilee of the nations;" —"darkness covered the earth, and gross darkness the people," and the unspeakable goodness of God provided a "light" whose beneficent beams should penetrate to the uttermost ends of the earth. The apostle John says of Christ,—"That was the true light which *lighteth every man that cometh into the world.*" It will be apparent then that our text has no partial, but a world-wide application. Christ, as the light of men, is the light of "every man that cometh into the world." "I am come," he said, "*a light into the world* that *whosoever* believeth on me should not *abide in darkness.*" "As long as I am in the world, *I am the light of the world.*"

But what are we to understand by this "*light*"? In what special sense is the Lord Jesus Christ "the Light of the World"? Let us glance again at the prophetic imagery in our text. We have, in this verse, an example of the poetic parallelism, a construction very common in Hebrew poetry. The idea of the first member of this parallelism is repeated and explained in the second member thus—

"The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light."

"They that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined."

Thus the "*darkness*" of the first member is represented and explained by the "*land of the shadow of death*" in the second member. The "darkness," then, is poetically *death's* gloomy "*shadow*," and actually the representation of a people living under *the dominion of death*, a *mortal* people, a people having *no inherent or constitutional deathlessness*, no essential life *beyond the narrow limits of the present brief span of earthly existence.* The poet-prophet repeats in our text the humiliating and affecting truth that *man*—intellectual and moral man, as well as physical man,—is "of the earth, earthy" —that the conscious being descends into "the dust of death,"—that all that characterizes and constitutes the creature *man* is absolutely *mortal.* "Dust *thou* art, and unto dust shalt *thou* return."

When, therefore, we hear the prophet say that upon such a people a "*light*" has "*shined*," and that they "have seen a *great light*," consistency of interpretation requires us to understand the "*light*" as the poetical image of *life.* If the "*darkness*" is the poetical image of *death* in our text, then the "*light*" must necessarily be the poetical image of *life.* And as this "*great light*" is *the child born*, and *the son given*, who is *Jesus Christ*, then we obtain the glorious truth that our Lord Jesus Christ is "the *Light* of men" in the sense of being the LIFE of men. And so writes the apostle John:—"In him was *Life* and THE LIFE WAS THE LIGHT MEN." And says our Lord himself, "I am the *Light of the World:* he that followeth me shall *not walk in darkness*, but shall have the LIGHT OF LIFE."

Glorious fact! but, alas! how little understood. This "Great Light" which has dawned upon our dark world, has not even yet, in the decline of the nineteenth century, been "comprehended" by the professing church. "The Light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended (or *embraced*) it not." This lament of the devoted John is true to this hour. The false theology of the churches on the subject of man's constitutional immortality is a dense and impenetrable darkness, through which the rays of this Scripture truth cannot penetrate. The churches, one and all, have "comprehended" the heathen philosophy of Plato concerning the immortality and separate state of the soul, hence they have not "comprehended" the "Light" which "shineth in the darkness" of this earthly theology. Nor will they until they turn away from their false teaching to the Scriptures of truth—and losing all confidence in popular creeds, however venerable, shall betake themselves to the true spirit of Christian fidelity "to the law and to the testimony," as the surest "lamp to their feet and light to their path." We have in the Scriptures "a more sure word of prophecy" than the theology of the churches, "whereunto," reader, "ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the DAY dawn (the 'day' of Christ's re appearing as 'the Resurrection and the Life,') and the Day-star arise in your hearts."—*Expositor, Edinburgh, Scotland.*

"LITTLE LESS THAN GOD."

We copy the following from Bro. Moncrieff's *Expositor.* In it the blasphemy of immortal-soulism is justly rebuked. "Clement" is Bro. M. himself.

"Helpless immortal! insect infinite!
A worm! a God." YOUNG.

The following communication reached us shortly after the publication of No. II. "Clement" has had it submitted to his judgment, and, after presenting it, his remarks will be appended.

Buchanan Street, Glasgow, 2d April, '53.

SIR,—In the Dialogue between *Clement* and *Quartus*, in the April number of the *Expositor*, two lines are quoted from Charles Wesley, viz:

"Nearest the great King of kings,
And little less than God."

These lines—applied by the poet to man—are said in the Dialogue to be "fulsome and impious." Did the writer know that this language is scriptural, occurring in the 8th Psalm, verse 5, *Vattichasserechu meghat me-elohim*, thou makest him to want but a little of God. Asking you to insert this from a sense of justice to Wesley, in the coming number of the *Expositor*, I remain yours, &c.

ELIZA HORNE.

CLEMENT answereth as follows:—

By all means, Mr. Editor, let the good lady's words have publication. I confess ignorance as to who was the author of the distich, and having not

a very high estimate, yea rather a kind of nausea of hymns and religious poetry in general, was not likely soon to make the discovery for myself. The ordinary hymns are so full of immortal-soulism, never-dying and ever-dying souls, of departings to glory at death, and addresses to the "King of Terrors," as if he was the great deliverer of the faithful, that my heart turns from them with disgust. When I want to read Platonism and Virgilism, give me the Greek and the Roman writer at once, but keep all baptised heathenism out of my sight.

The writer of the lines was a good man, but does this lady think, that because he was pleased to paraphrase the 8th Psalm as he did, at least this part of it, that I am obliged to accept his words, and to speak of them as any thing else than they seem to me to be? Coin bad money, and circulate it who may, reprobate money it was at first, now is, and shall ever be: the more pity that it should have issued from a pious man's mint. When Paul was ignorant he did many foolish things, and spoke many unguarded and impious words, and surely in as much as Mr. C. W. was a disciple of the heathenish dogma that man has an immortal soul; moreover, when the poet was a believer in the Serpent's theology, that even though man might sin he would not, could not die, we need not be astonished that he should have written sentiments both unwise and God-dishonoring. He composed, as he believed, and up to his knowledge; just as the apostle spoke as he believed, and according to his information, and yet he discovered by and bye that his knowledge was profound ignorance, and his anti-Christian zeal "little less" than madness. There is great excuse for Mr. W. He lived in a time when immortal-soulism was undisturbed, when the old Serpent's assertion had not been honestly and boldly confronted with the revelation of God, as it has recently been in America and Britain. After all that has of late been done to expose the deluding dogmas about deathless souls,—after the reiterated demands for one plain verse announcing the doctrine of natural immortality and the imaginary stupendous greatness of man by creation, to which no answer has yet come, a writer requires an amount of courage, and we fear inconsideration of no ordinary extent, who would adopt Wesley's words and apply them to a human being now. Even supposing man to be immortal by nature, and the greatest being ever reared, they are terms of fulsome man-flattery, and just as I would call the dogma of Romanism impious, that represents a communicant to swallow his God as often as he kneels at the altar, so I presume to retain the other appellation given by me to the sentiment contained in the couplet; and consider that he who would employ it in this age errs more lamentably than its originator himself.

But then is it not Scriptural? Does not the passage assert, "Thou hast made him a little lower than the *elohim*," rendered angels in the common Bible? Sometimes *elohim* is translated "God," sometimes "Gods," and here, we are convinced with much propriety, "angels." Does your correspondent know, that in the 82d Psalm this term is twice rendered "Gods"? "He judgeth among the Gods" (*elohim*) v. 1; and "I have said ye are Gods" (*elohim*) v. 6. The Jewish magistrates are the parties referred to, for we read, v. 2, "How long will ye (*i. e.*, ye *elohim*) judge unjustly"? and v. 7, "But ye shall die like men." Now a word capable of being so employed can have its proper rendering and meaning determined only by the circumstances in which on any occasion it is found. Judging, apparently, by this common-sense rule, our translation was made to run thus: "Thou hast made him (man, v. 6.) a little lower than the angels." The Septuagint translates *elohim* in this verse by *angelous*, angels; and Paul, in Heb. 2: 7, when applying this passage to the Lord Jesus, quotes it in this manner,—"Thou madest him (man, v. 6,) a little lower (margin, 'a little while lower') than the angels," (*angelous*). Another verse, illustrative of our remarks about *elohim*, is Psalm 97: 7, "Worship him all ye Gods" (*elohim*), where the Septuagint renders *elohim* by *angeloi*, angels; and the passage is obviously quoted in Heb. 1: 6, thus,—"Let all the angels of God worship him."

Moreover, in the context of the 8th Psalm, we find the writer testifying not about man's unutterable greatness, but his littleness in God's eye.—"When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and stars which thou hast ordained; what is man that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man, that thou visitest him?" v. 3, 4. The Psalmist is astonished that God should think of man; had he been a "little less than God,"—a few inches down in the scale of being—would the condescension, extolled so sublimely, have been discoverable? With David agrees his royal son, and he uses language that would have drawn down unmeasured scorn upon my head, had it issued thence. "I said in my heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, and that they might see that they themselves are beasts. For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts: even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other, yea, they have all *one* breath (*ruach*, breath, or spirit of life); so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast;—for all is vanity. All go unto one place: all are of the dust; and all turn to dust again." Ecc. 3: 18–20. In a similar strain Isaiah speaks, "It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers." 40: 22.—Had Mr. C. W. considered these passages well, and that man is "mortal" and "corruptible," and "vain," and "frail," and requires to "seek for immortality," even he would have startled at his own couplet when it dropt from his pen, and would have deemed it sense, and Scripture, and piety, to abide by the common version.

"Little less than God;" the words tempt me to write a few lines more, and you will indulge my pen. I can understand what is meant by one man, one tree, one island, one globe, one created intellect, being a little less than another; but how any produced being can be spoken of as a little less than God, exceeds my comprehension. It confounds me, it pains me. The created are a little less than the uncreated! the dependent than the absolutely independent! the finite than the infinite! Does not the writer of the note, assuming that she may approve Mr. W.'s language, though I am disposed to give her credit for a better perception of what is due to the majesty of Deity, and a keener insight into the relations and disparities between the created and the Omnipotent Producer—I say with kindness, does she not see that from the finite, however lofty, to the infinite, there must always rise an infinity? Is infinity a fractional sum? Why, it in-

cludes all sums, and to us is necessarily incomprehensible.

In the course of ages there have been produced even human beings, allow me to remark, concerning whom it would be deemed immense presumption were any ordinary mortal to affirm, I am a little less than these. What would we think of the man who should tell us, he deemed himself only a small degree inferior to Demosthenes, or Michael Angelo, or Milton, or Bacon? We would pity his weakness, and look on him with anxiety. And of each man—a child of dust, frail as the moth, though frequently endowed with splendid capacities—shall it become wise to affirm that he is but a little beneath the eternal God? Shall we perfume ourselves with the rankest odors of pride, and come before him with the songs of vanity; or shall we, conscious of our weakness and insignificance, lie low in the dust, and suffer ourselves, like the Jewish prophets, to be penetrated and overwhelmed with an awful sense of his immeasurable and incomprehensible grandeur?

There is sense in man's being a little less than the *elohim*, or the angels; and blessed are they who "by patient continuance in well-doing," shall reach the promised glory and honor and incorruption, for then the words of the Lord Christ shall be realized in their experience, "neither can they die any more, but are equal unto the angels," *i. e.*, the angels "of God in heaven." Luke 20 : 36, Matt. 22 : 30.

"Clement" trusts that your correspondent from the West is among the "elect ladies," and that at last she will be "equal unto the angels of God."

"BIBLE VS. TRADITION."

We give another extract from this work, this month, which goes to show something of the strength of the Scripture argument against inherent immortality. Let it be pondered well. It begins to be an admitted fact, by our opponents, that the Bible alone must settle this question. That is the true issue.—EDITOR.

THE WICKED MUST FOR EVER CEASE TO EXIST.

We shall quote a few other passages that, if possible, still more emphatically declare the wicked will be totally blotted out of existence. Ps. 37 : 20, "The wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the *fat of lambs:* they shall *consume;* into smoke shall *they consume away.*" 9 v, "For evil doers shall be *cut off*....For yet a little while, and the wicked *shall not be:* yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and *it shall not be.*" If the place of the wicked is to be in hell, and they are to be there in a conscious state, then they will neither be "cut off" nor "consumed," nor "perish," but will be alive in hell, and David has testified falsely concerning them. But as David has truly testified, and is in perfect agreement with the whole tenor of the word of God, then are modern teachers, who preach to us of 'eternal torments,' found false witnesses before God. Fives times in this Psalm are the wicked said to be "cut off." 34 v, "Wait on the Lord, and keep his way, and he shall exalt thee to inherit the land, (the land promised to Abraham and his seed Christ:) when the wicked are cut off, thou shalt see it. I have seen the wicked in great power,....yet *he passed away*, and lo, *he was not:* yea I sought him, but he could not be found." 38 v, "The transgressors shall be (*shomad*) *annihilated* together: the end of the wicked shall be cut off." If an "immortal soul" were left, then this language cannot be true. Compare all this with Mal. 4: 1–3, where he describes the wicked as being "burned up root and branch." If the soul be either a root, or branch, or part, or whole of the wicked, it is utterly consumed with him.

Ezekiel (26: 18) prophesies of the King of Tyre, because of the multitude of his iniquities; "Therefore will I bring forth a fire from the midst of thee, it shall devour thee, and I will bring thee to ashes upon the earth in the sight of all them that behold thee. Thou shalt be a terror, and *never shalt thou be any more.*" Mat. 3; 12; Luke 3 : 17. "His winnowing shovel is in his hand; and he will thoroughly cleanse his grain; he will gather his wheat into the granary, and consume the chaff in unquenchable fire." Mark, the unquenchable fire burns up, or consumes the chaff, the wicked; and neither chaff nor the wicked, can exist after they are burned up, *burned up root and branch.* Isa. 51 : 8, "For the moth shall eat them up like a garment, and the worm shall eat them like wool." Worms and unquenchable fire alike consume, the fire cannot be quenched till it has thoroughly performed its office; when the carcass is entirely consumed, the fire will of course go out, though it cannot be put out while the fuel lasts. Paul in Heb. 12 : 29, calls God a consuming fire, not a tormenting fire, fire cannot torment without consuming. In Job 31 : 12, "It is a fire that consumeth to destruction;" not a fire that preserveth to torment. Isa. 9 : 19, "Through the wrath of the Lord of hosts is the land darkened, and the people shall be as *maakhesheth*, a devouring, or thing to be devoured, for the fire." The margin says meat, but the same word occurs Ez. 21 : 32, connected with the coming of him whose right it is to reign on the throne of David, and the judgments he will then execute. "I will pour out my indignation upon thee, I will blow against thee in the fire of my wrath, and deliver thee into the hand of brutish men, skillful to destroy. Thou shalt be for fuel (*maakhesheth*, a thing to be devoured) for the fire; thy blood shall be in the midst of the land; *thou shalt be no more remembered:* for I the Lord have spoken it." The same word occurs in Ez. 15 : 4, 6, where it is applied to the wood of the vine tree, and the wicked are compared with it, as fit only to be burned.—And God says, 5 v, "Behold, when it was whole, it was fit for no work: how much less shall it be yet fit for any work, when the fire hath devoured it and it is burned?" But if the wicked have something in them that cannot be burned, such a thing as an "immortal soul," there would be no similitude; that soul would yet be fit for something, if it were only for "eternal torment."

Ps. 73: 19, "How are they brought into desolation, as in a moment! they are utterly consumed with terrors." 2 Sam. 23 : 7, They like thorns "shall be utterly burned with fire." 2 Pet. 2 : 12, They "shall utterly perish in their own corruption." Surely the soul does not escape when the wicked are 'utterly burned,' 'utterly consumed,' when they 'utterly perish'!! Is. 47: 14, "Behold, they shall

be as stubble; the fire shall burn them; they shall not deliver their souls from the power of the flame." Is. 10: 17, 18, "The Light of Israel (Christ) shall be for a fire, and his Holy One for a flame: and it shall burn and devour his thorns and his briers in one day; and shall consume the glory of the forest, and of his fruitful field, *both soul and body*." That is, both flesh and being. Both these texts declare that the soul is burned. To affirm that the soul is not burned up, is equal to saying that the man is not burned up. Yea, God will destroy 'both body and soul in Gehenna.' Mat. 10: 28. David prays. Ps. 7: 9, "Oh let the wickedness of the wicked *come to an end*." A prayer dictated by the Holy Spirit is equal to a declaration that the thing shall be. But the wickedness of the wicked will only end when they are destroyed. Were a theologian of these days to utter this idea he would be rebuked by his compeers with the declaration, that "the wicked will increase in wickedness, and blaspheme God to all eternity." But let us hear David again. Ps. 10: 15, "Break thou the arm (or power) of the wicked and the evil man: seek out his wickedness till thou find none. The Lord is King for ever and ever: the heathen *are perished* out of his land." When Christ has fully established his kingdom, there will be no wickedness to be found. Why? The Universalist tells us, because God will cleanse the wicked. The believer in eternal torments tells us flatly, 'It is not so, the wicked will continue to blaspheme God in a hell of eternal torments.' But the Bible tells us, Rev. 5: 13, "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, were heard. saying, Blessing and honor, and glory and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." All that are living at that time will praise the Lamb. But where are the wicked? Ps. 9: 5, "Thou hast rebuked the heathen, *thou hast destroyed the wicked*, thou hast put out their name for ever and ever." Ps. 69: 28. Their name has been blotted out of the book of the living. For says Job 36: 6, "He *preserveth not the life of the wicked*." For God will not contend for ever, neither will he be always wroth. Isa. 57: 16. Ps. 37: 10, "For yet a little while and the wicked shall not be." Is. 41: 12, "Thou shalt seek them, and shalt not find them, even them that contended with thee: they that war against thee shall be as nothing, and as a thing of nought." See also Isa. 22: 14; Ez. 35: 5; and Isa. 10: 25. "For yet a very little while, and the indignation shall cease, and mine anger in their destruction." Thus the controversy between God and the wicked will end, the indignation of God will cease. The wicked will be utterly exterminated. Acts 3: 22, "For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that every (*psuche*) soul, which will not hear that prophet, (*exolothreuthesetai ek tou laou*,) shall be utterly exterminated out of, or out from among the people." There will exist no wicked, for their very souls, or beings will be exterminated.

Well might Jeremiah pray, 10: 24, "O Lord, correct me, but with judgment; not in thine anger, lest thou bring me to nothing." Isa. 41: 11, "Behold, all they that were incensed against thee shall be ashamed and confounded: they shall be *as nothing*; and they that strive with thee shall perish. Thou shalt seek them, and shalt *not find them*, even them that contended with thee: they that war against thee shall be as nothing, and as a thing of nought." Can a soul, brought to nothing, suffer 'endless misery'? Job 6: 18, "The paths of their way are turned aside; they go to nothing and perish." Job 8: 22, "The dwelling place of the wicked shall come to nought." Margin, not be. So the wicked will have no place to exist in; even God cannot find them, they will have perished out of existence.

Ps. 104: 35, "Let the sinners be consumed out of the earth, and let the wicked be no more." The reader will remember, that "the earth has been given to the children of men;" that the righteous are to be rewarded in the earth, and the wicked are to be punished in the earth.

The invention of an immortal soul, has necessitated the invention of a place to put it in; hence has arisen a fabled heaven "beyond the bounds of time and space," a hell in which to punish and torment the wicked for ever; but in the Bible we find that to root a sinner out of the earth, is made by a parallelism, equal to the destruction of his being.—Ps. 59: 13, "Consume them in wrath, consume them, that they *may not be*." Ps. 119: 19, "Thou puttest away (or *shovath*, thou causest to cease) all the wicked of the earth like (*seegeem*, cinder or) dross." Ps. 9: 5, "Thou hast rebuked the heathen, thou hast destroyed the wicked, thou hast put out their name for ever and ever." Prov. 10: 25, "As the whirlwind passeth, so are the wicked no more: but the righteous are an everlasting foundation." 27 v, "The fear of the Lord prolongeth (or addeth) days: but the years of the wicked shall be shortened." But the duration of an 'immortal' soul can neither be increased nor diminished. Prov. 12: 7, "The wicked are overthrown and *are not*: but the house (or family) of the righteous shall stand."—Ez. 32: 7, "When I shall (*kovoh*) extinguish thee, I will cover the heaven and make the stars thereof dark." Lam. 3: 66, "Persecute and destroy them in anger from under the heavens of the Lord."—Job 20: 5–9, "The triumphing of the wicked is short....He shall perish for ever like his own dung: they which have seen him shall say, Where is he? He shall fly away as a dream, and shall not be found: yea, he shall be chased away as a vision of the night. The eye also which saw him shall see no more; neither shall his place any more behold him." Speaking of Babylon and of the Chaldeans, Isa. 43: 16, 17, says, "Thus saith the Lord....who bringeth forth the chariot and horse, the army and the power; they shall lie down together, they shall not rise: they are extinct, they are quenched as tow." We know not what language could more emphatically set forth the annihilation of the wicked than the foregoing. Nah. 1: 9, "What do ye imagine against the Lord? he will make an utter end: affliction shall not rise up the second time.—For while they are folden as thorns, and while they are drunken as drunkards, they (his enemies) shall be devoured as stubble fully dry." Amos 8: 14, "They that swear by the sin of Samaria, and say, thy God, O Dan, liveth; even they shall fall, and never rise up again." Ob. 15–18, "For the day of the Lord is near....For as ye have drunk upon my holy mountain, so shall all the heathen drink continually, yea, they shall drink, and they shall swal-

low down, and THEY SHALL BE AS THOUGH THEY HAD NOT BEEN. And the house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame, and the house of Esau for stubble, and they shall kindle in them, and devour them; and there shall not be any remaining of the house of Esau; for the Lord hath spoken it."

We have presented 50 texts that clearly prove the wicked will become extinct; and, in all, 230 plain declarations of the Holy Bible that the wicked will be destroyed without remedy, body and soul, root and branch, all of them will became as nothing, they will have no existence. It is in vain to plead that some of these texts may apply to judgments that have been already executed; it is obvious that they apply to the wicked as a class—and not to the righteous—and speak of the end of their existence.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, JUNE, 1853.

PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE.—We are glad to find that some interest is waked up on the subject, and to the object of this Committee. *Men* to engage in the cause are not lacking; good men and true; but they are modest men who do not like to *seem* to be asking aid to sustain their families while they travel and "*preach the word.*" Our attention has been called to several of this description within a few weeks. Shall they be compelled to "*serve tables*" to the neglect of the great work we are called to do? It *must not be:* God will require it at our hands, if these men are left to bury their gifts under the care of providing for their households, while many have more than food and raiment, and are adding house to house, field to field, gold to gold, and withholding that which God demands, and which it ought to be our delight to give to help spread the glorious truths abroad which are to throw down Dagon and the Dragon, with all those God-dishonoring Traditions which have so long filled the Church of God with a gloom that has embittered all its joys, and made it impossible to "rejoice in the Lord always." Men fearing God, ought we not to "hate covetousness," and to show our faith by our works? Shall such a golden opportunity as is now presented to spread the glorious truth of "*Life and Immortality through Jesus Christ alone*" be suffered to languish for lack of funds which we can neither eat nor drink ourselves, and which if hoarded up will only burden our minds with care, if they do not draw our hearts away from Eternal Life? Let not our appeal come to you any longer in vain—*Help—Help*, and do it *quickly*. No time should be lost: the fields are white to harvest. Will you help the laborers immediately? We are assured by a minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church, in Ohio, that our views are speading in that church in that State, and he himself proclaims the doctrine, more or less, and feels determined to do so more fully before long. He expects in a short time to be ready to give himself wholly to the work. In the State of Maine, a brother is commended to our notice for the work who has been much circumscribed by lack of that aid which he is too modest to ask for himself.—Like cases are continually coming to our knowledge, and the cry for light comes up on every side. Once more, we ask, shall help be given? or, will you who have the means still *withheld?* Soon must we give account of our stewardship. Will not many have to lament in that day that they withheld more than was meet? and will they not find it has tended to poverty? Come now, friends, "as the Lord has prospered you," help the cause you profess to prize and love: help those men of God who have ability *to speak*, that they may go out feeling that they are cared for by their brethren. If we do not help them we cannot honestly and heartily ask God to bless: such prayers would be mockery. "Be ye warmed, and be ye filled," and yet give them not the things they need is not the way to serve God and Christ in their servants called to proclaim *Life—Eternal Life in and through Christ alone.* We leave our appeal with you, trusting it will not be in vain. O, may God help us all to open wide our hearts and hands to push forward this glorious work.

RECEIPTS in the Committee's *treasury* since our last:—

A sister, Williamsburg, N. Y. - -	$1.00
A brother, Washington Co., N. Y. - -	2.00
Friends in Newark, N. J., by Bro. Blain,	12.00
Friends in Rochester, N. Y., by Br. Blain	8.00

—o—

BIBLE VS. TRADITION.—Hundreds of copies of this work have already been scattered; and so far as we have heard, it has fully met the expectations of those who have looked for it. It should be placed in every family in the land immediately. It will help mightily to stay the desolating plague of "*Spirit Rappings*," and bring men to sober sense; thus saving them from the wild fancies which characterize bigots and fanatics of every class. We have given one more extract from the work this month, which we hope will stir up those who have not yet ordered it to send immediately. It contains 312 pages, 18 mo. *Price 75 cents.* Postage 15 cents, when sent by mail, if *pre-paid*; or 23 cents if not. For *one dollar*, sent us free of expense, we will send a copy of the work, and one copy of each of Ham's works (*double* Examiner) and *pre-pay* the

postage on them all. For $5 *ten* copies of the work will be sent, but it must be at the expense of the purchaser, whether sent by mail or express, in such cases.

———o———

BEAUTIFUL.—"Its doctrine of Immortality, fully imbibed, makes the King of terrors an insignificant pretender—nay more, a victim securely chained,—nay more, a servant, opening the door to endless life."

We cut the above from the Northern Ch. Advocate, in an editorial article on "*The Sufficiency of Truth.*" It is speaking of the "numerous causes of the morbid sensitiveness prevailing among religious people," and says, there "is a totally disproportionate view of the truth as it is in Christ, or that great scheme of salvation known as the gospel. Christianity," it says, "is a liberalizing, quiet-giving, soul-confirming system. But it must be understood. It cannot produce these hallowed effects on minds superficially enlightened." It adds, "The system is ennobling, but it does not ennoble men till they come under its influence." Thus far we fully harmonize with the Advocate: these are true sentiments; but next follows the expressions at the head of this article.

"Christianity's doctrine of immortality," says the *Advocate.* But in this member of the paragraph there is no fault; because Christianity has its "doctrine of immortality:" and a glorious doctrine it is: that of a gift of God, through Jesus and the *resurrection.* This doctrine "*fully imbided,*" gives support in death. But the immortality the *Advocate* contends for is the *natural* immortality of the soul, which "makes the King of terrors an insignificant pretender"! Ah, Hezekiah, what made you *weep sore* when this "insignificant pretender" approached you! and Paul, how came you to say, that Epaphroditus being "sick nigh unto death," "God had *mercy on him*" and restored him! What *mercy* was it to be delivered from this "Insignificant pretender"? Did Hezekiah and Paul not know that the "King of terrors" was "a victim securely chained—nay more, a servant *opening the door to endless* life"? What's that weeping about, Hezekiah? What's that *mercy*, Paul, in God, to keep Epaphroditus out of "*endless life*"? Why, Paul, you and Hezekiah could not have "understood" Christianity and its teachings!!

In the theology of the *Advocate*, the "King of terrors" is substituted for, or *put in the place of* Jesus Christ, who is "the resurrection and the life." The "King of terrors" has the "*keys,*" and attends to "opening the door to endless life;" and Jesus died and rose again in vain! In vain does our Lord declare—"I am he that liveth, and was dead; and behold I am alive for ever more, and have the *keys* of death and hades." No, saith the *Advocate*, the "King of terrors is a servant opening the door to endless life"!

We do not wonder there is a "morbid sensitiveness prevailing among religious people" while Christ is thus robbed and the "King of terrors" exalted. The wonder is that there is any Christianity left at all in this degenerate age of fables. Let "Christianity be understood"—let the truth be fully known that there is no league between Christ and the "King of terrors"; and that Christ by a *resurrection*, and not the "King of terrors" by his foul breath, introduces men into life eternal, and then we may hope to see less "morbid sensitiveness prevailing among religious people." "Christianity must be understood," Br. *Advocate*, to feel its full power and mighty comforts. May you yet understand it.

———o———

AS MIGHT BE EXPECTED.—The following statement is taken from the "*Gospel Banner.*" The announcement is nothing strange. The fact is, at heart, the greater portion of thinking men who believe in the natural immortality of man are Universalists. How can they be anything else? The doctrine of endless sin and suffering is too horrible and God-dishonoring to be believed except in the darkness and barbarism of the barbarous ages.—Such a doctrine cannot endure the light, and is doomed to perish. What shall save the religious community from all becoming Universalists or Restorationists, while they maintain the unscriptural notion of man's natural immortality? We hesitate not to say, they must, inevitably, be swept down those currents unless saved from it by abandoning their false assumption. *Man* is *mortal:* and can only have an endless life, or conscious being, by a union with the second Adam, the head of the spiritual and immortal creation: that is God's order, and eternal purpose. He that rejects Christ turns away from life, and utterly perishes in his own natural corruption. But to the statement which has led to these remarks; it is as follows:

The Rev. Dr. Dick, that good Christian and philosopher, who is the author of so many of the best theological and philosophical books in the English language—books that will be standard works as long as the literary world lasts,—is a Universalist—an open, confessed Universalist. He resides in Dundee, Scotland, and has all the frank intelligence of an honest Scotchman. The foreign correspondent of the Boston Post, "*Communipaw,*" who writes so much and so well for that valuable paper, in a letter to his sister, the wife of Br. W. H. Wagoner, of Methuen, Mass., published in the *Trumpet*, thus speaks of the good old saint:—

"I have spent over two weeks at Dundee and Broughty Ferry, during which time, nearly every day, I visited Br. Thomas Dick, D.D. He is a good old man, thoroughly Scotch, and in religious sentiment a decided Universalist. Such is the fact which I have from his own lips. He wrote father a long letter while I was there."

To this Br. Wagoner adds:

"In this letter [to Br. W.'s wife's father] Dr. Dick gives some very cogent reasons for rejecting the doctrine of endless sin and punishment, and then says, in substance, that he believes all the chastisements of God are intended for the reformation and ultimate benefit of the chastised."

Behold, ye immortal-soulists, the fruits of your system, and prepare to follow your leaders, or else abandon their false theory of natural immortality. That theory is the fruitful source of almost all errors in theology, and of all the corruptions of the word of God. Once be established in the Bible truth—"No Immortality, nor Endless Life except through Christ alone,"—and Universalism, Popery, and all kindred systems of delusion and deception fall. Let the friends of truth bestir themselves, in these days, to spread far and wide the glorious proclamation of *Life only through Christ.*

———o———

BURNING THE EXAMINER.—A new subscriber writes us:

"I wish you to send me another copy of the Examiner for May, as my wife *burnt* the one you sent before I read it. Such is the advice of the preacher."

She doubtless had more *light* than *her preacher* ever gave her, while the Examiner was burning. We send another cheerfully. If it should meet with a similar fate as the previous one, let us know and we will send again.

———o———

"DISHONESTY."—The *Advent Review* for May complains of our censure of it in the April Examiner. Perhaps we were a little too severe; but another paper, at Boston, Mass., had published an article on the same subject, purporting to be a "*report*" of a discourse of ours delivered in 1843; which "*report*" we had condemned, and publicly protested against any one publishing *as our views*, that discourse or any other on the same subject, delivered near that time, because we were satisfied that so far as the literal return of Jacob's posterity was concerned those discourses were incorrect. If any body choose to publish them without our name, or stating honestly the fact that we did not *now* hold those views, we would not complain: but we thought that a repetition of the Boston act of injustice, by the *Advent Review*, called for a severe rebuke; but as the editor now says—"We regret that we did not state that George Storrs had renounced a portion *** contained in that discourse," &c., we cheerfully forgive him: for our end in administering the rebuke is answered.

The *Review* complains that we *withheld* the Examiner from it which contained our charge. "We regret" that we did not send it *direct* to the *Review;* but we were negligent in that matter, as it was not on our list of exchanges; yet as the *Review* did receive it, it has had the benefit of it.

———o———

ENCOURAGEMENT.—Br. S. A. Chaplin writes—"The cause of our Redeemer is flourishing in Indiana. The Bible doctrine of Immortality through Christ alone, is making decided progress. In some parts, large numbers are led, by the exhibition of the Word, to embrace this and other important kindred truths. In other places, there is a slow, though constant accession of numbers, who embrace the teachings of Revelation in preference to the dogmas of human origin. You have great cause to rejoice that your labors have not been in vain. Your sermons and other tracts have been the means of spreading the knowledge of man's constitution as a mortal being, and his final destiny—if an unreclaimed sinner—to thousands who now rejoice in knowing that the popular exhibitions upon these subjects, are mere Pagan chimeras, revamped by the *man of sin.* I say this for encouragement, as I am aware that you have been compelled to sacrifice much for the truth's sake. Hoping that the Great Head of the Church will be with you to the end, I subscribe myself, yours,

In the blessed Hope."

———o———

"ANALYTICAL INVESTIGATIONS *Concerning the Credibility of the Scriptures, and of the Religious Systems inculcated in them: together with a Historical Exhibition of Human Conduct during the several dispensations under which mankind have been placed by their Creator.* By J. H. M'Culloh, M.D., 2 vols., 8 vo. Baltimore, 1852."

Dr. M'Culloh has sent us a copy of this work, for which he will please accept our thanks. We esteem it a valuable acquisition to our library. We have yet had only time to examine it partially.—We admire his bold and fearless search after truth; and rejoice that our author has given us a work free from sectarian trammels. His manner of treating the subjects embraced in his work is well calculated to confound if not to convince atheists, deists, sceptics, and *self-styled* orthodoxy. He has shown conclusively that by "*Natural Theology*" no certain knowledge of God can be obtained beyond the fact of his *intelligence* and *power;* and that the human notions concerning the nature of moral distinctions, such as "that the principles of right and wrong, justice and injustice, are eternal and immutable in

their nature,"—is a mere assumption. He remarks —"There is a prodigious mistake among men on this subject; for as they almost universally consider their ideas of moral distinctions to be absolute, and not merely relative, so under this delusion, they have presumed to judge of the proceedings of God as implicated in the biblical statements, by what they have supposed to be immutable principles in determining all moral actions."

Dr. M'Culloh then proceeds to demonstrate the error of the assumption, and to show that the reasoning based upon it, when made absolute, is also false and erroneous. We would like to give large extracts, but our limits forbid. His argument to be appreciated must be read, and none can read it without profit; so we think.

On the subject of *Immortality*, Dr. M'Culloh remarks—"One might as well drive a nail into the works of a watch and expect it would continue to perform its contemplated movement, as attempt to reconcile the inherent immortality of the human soul with the theory and teaching of the Scriptures, whether in their direct or indirect annunciations of Jehovah's purposes. No exercise of the human understanding can exhibit the doctrine of the everlasting torment of the wicked to be consistent with the infinite perfections and attributes of Jehovah. It distinctly supposes that he made mankind with the clear foreknowledge that the great majority of them, in innumerable millions, would be ultimately subjected to an endless existence in torture and suffering. It may be said however," he adds, "that we are not to reject a doctrine of Scripture because it is irreconcilable to our notions as to what may be right. Surely not; I fully admit such a statement. But then this submission of our understanding extends only to Jehovah's revelations, and not to theological assumptions of men on the subject. Our difference with the upholders of the doctrine of the eternal existence and everlasting torment of the wicked, does not involve the incomprehensibility of Jehovah's purposes, but whether the Scriptures teach any such doctrine. From a very full investigation of the subject I am fully satisfied, *first*, that they do not teach the inherent immortality of the human soul, and *secondly*, that they do teach that the wicked are annihilated after the day of judgment."

Dr. M'Culloh in the Appendix to his work goes into a full investigation of the subjects, which, at a future time, we may either give in full or extracts of much interest. Though we are not now prepared to say how fully we are in agreement with him in his general views, as developed in his work, yet we are persuaded it must be a work of great interest and usefulness, and hope it will have a wide circulation and a thorough reading. The work contains over a thousand octavo pages.—Price $4.

—o—

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS.

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM.

The phraseology of the sacred Scriptures concerning the sufferings and death of the Lord Jesus Christ, has given rise to much controversy since the apostolic age, and rival systems have gradually risen up, each claiming for itself an exclusive orthodoxy. Notwithstanding the general distaste for controversy, and especially for theological controversy, we counsel every man, "laic" as well as "cleric," to make this a question of great personal interest, even at the risk of involving himself in the meshes of one of the most profound and subtile disputes that ever occupied the arena of religious polemics. Theology cannot be safely treated as one of the professional sciences, and handed over to a professional class of men. It embraces questions of a too sacred and personal nature to be treated with that courteous deference with which unprofessional modesty is wont to approach a learned science. In its most important aspect, it is the science of personal duty to God and men,—of salvation and immortality, and as such, all ought to be students of this science whatever their sex or education. To attain to this wisdom is to have graduated in the highest departments of theological science; and this elevation, we are persuaded, can be reached most successfully by a steady refusal to turn aside into the circuitous by-paths of controversial theology, which only lead the mind round and round the lowest base of the mighty ascent, and divert it from that onward and upward course whither it ought to be ever tending. The theology of the churches, from the second century downwards, has amassed together for the student of such a lore a heterogeneous confusion of fanciful speculations, abounding in absurdities and contradictions. And the nineteenth century of the Christian era has added its theological quota to that of the preceding centuries. Now, theology, in its modern comprehensive signification, takes into its wide circle of inquiry this vast domain of doctrinal divinity, and the professional theologian is imperfectly equipped who has not some acquaintance with this branch of his science. But the inquirer after truth can well afford to leave the professional student to this as well as to some other branches of his professional studies, and may be thankful that God in his wisdom and mercy has not constituted this the proper and only safe route to the attainment of truth.—We tremble for the religious intelligence and safety of any man who is sent on his search after the truth as it is in Jesus into this vast wilderness of theological wisdom. Nay, more, we should tremble for the result if he were shut up to any single age of the historic church subsequent to the apostolic age, and required to find a system of doctrines which should satisfy his intellectual and moral judgments, as well as constrain his affections and service Godwards. We except not the existing age, with all

its boasted emancipation from religious error. If the Bible were suddenly withdrawn from the eye and the memory of the race, we should tremble for the salvation of that man who, with a healthy understanding and moral nature, should be called upon to find his way to heaven by the exclusive light of the so-called living churches. The remark may appear rash, but is it not justified by the existing state of the churches, which, with the Bible more widely circulated than ever, are declared, by their own leading men, to be in a state bordering on spiritual death?*

No doubt there are more causes than one that have contributed to this acknowledged general defection of piety; but we believe that one of the chief causes, if not *the* chief cause, is *a radically unsound theology*. We believe that the moral power of the gospel will be found to lie in the *Cross of Christ*, and that the simple utterance of this solemn fact has failed to reach the ear of the masses through the angry impatience of dogmatic voices which has succeeded in drowning its influential but "still small voice." Thence, if religious men would but cease to be the refracting medium, streams forth an effulgence of light which scatters the darkness of a myriad of mysteries. Thence radiates a warmth which, but for its passage across a desert of doctrinal divinity, would come as a new "breath of life" to kindle a new creation of God-loving and God-fearing creatures. But its breath is felt to be feverish and fetid; men inhale it, but they are not spiritually vitalized,—like vapor of sulphur, rather than empyreal ether, it does not supply and succour, but stifles the spiritual life. The Cross, the centre of calm and tender influences, is supplanted by a factitious resemblance, bearing its consecrated name, around which lightnings play, and loud, hollow thunders convulsively peal, emblematic of eternal wrath which empties and expends itself on the crushed form there hanging. And this is the Cross of the popular churches, before which they bow down in professed admiration and gratitude.—Thence what else can emanate but sounds of terror and dismay? The voice is that of Sinai, not of Sion; and, like Sinai, it is unapproachable by conscience-stricken humanity. Mankind must be dragged there, and drilled by divinity,—they are not drawn. A Cross is elevated by the popular priesthood which terrifies and repels, instead of *the* Cross which encourages and woos the timid hopes of mankind. The Cross of the churches is the symbol of the exhausted wrath of Omnipotence, whose influence is to scare away in the heart-broken affright, rather than to invite the approach of calm, penitent confidence. And with *such* a cross, can we wonder that popular Christianity is impotent? Whoever heard of fire-flashing vengeance melting a soul in love,—subduing its sin-fraught terrors, and warming the heart into the willing worship of God?—Another and milder flame must do this. And such a conversion of the Cross into a moral significance diametrically opposite to that which really belongs to it, has not only destroyed the natural moral influence of the Cross of Christ, but has left the popular Christianity with scarcely any efficient moral power at all.*

The effort made to preserve the *show* of Divine *love* in connection with such a theory of the death of Christ, indicates the secret conviction that *love*, and not wrath, is the constraining energy of true religion, and that without some show of love, the

* Dr. Chalmers thus wrote, in an article which he contributed to the *North British Review*, "As things stand at present, our Creeds and Confessions have become effete; and the Bible a dead letter; and the orthodoxy which was at one time the glory, by withering into the inert and lifeless, is now the shame and reproach of all the churches." Mr. J. Angell James, in his work, *An Earnest Ministry the Want of the Times*, published in 1847, observes that there is a general "deadness over the churches, that revivals are rare, and conversions few, while the power of godliness among professing Christians is low." Dr. Campbell concluded his editorial labors of 1849 with the following, among other remarks to the same purpose, —"We think then, taking Great Britain as a whole, the state of religion is not in a satisfactory condition; and even less so than it was at the close of last year.—Such seems to be the view of all communities concerning their own churches; and of most pastors concerning their own flocks.....At present there is a general complaint that the work of conversion advances very slowly, and that in a multitude of cases it is almost at a standstill." Mr. E Miall, in his admirable work on the *British Churches*, published in 1849, says,—"'Thou art neither hot nor cold' would best describe the general condition of the churches,—and the manifested God which we take Christianity to be, notwithstanding the multiplicity of organized bodies by whom his claims are ostensibly set forth, is responded to so partially and faintly that, in the middle of this the nineteenth century, an inquiry into the causes of the comparative failure is not merely pertinent, but imperatively demanded." In the *British Quarterly Review* for August, 1851, Art., "Naturalism versus Inspiration," the writer asks, "Whence these many unsettled, disorderly, and sickly churches? Whence these heavy complaints about the feebleness and inadequacy of our existing ministry, and this small promise of improvement as regards the ministry of the future?....We see [he observes] this disastrous course of things coming over us so clearly,—like a sweep of destiny,—that had we the resources of what is called thereligious world at our command, we should, we think, feel constrained to appropriate no small part of those means which are now expended, and with so little apparent result, on collateral and distant objects, *to this life-struggle at our own door.*"

* If the ancient Levitical sacrifices were *types of an expiatory sacrifice* to be afterwards made by the Lord Jesus Christ, then the ancient worshippers must have been perpetually called to contemplate in them, *human guilt arraigned before the Divine implacable justice, and receiving its reward in a terrible punishment.* Such a perpetual contemplation of *vengeance taking its course* would necessarily depress and discourage the mind (to say nothing of the moral education which the Hebrew mind would naturally receive), in proportion to its vivid apprehension of the nature of the sacrificial institution. What could be the effect but to fill the worshipper with trembling awe and timidity?—If the popular opinion of the expiatory character of the Mosaic sacrifices be correct, then it is difficult to understand how the evil above-mentioned could be avoided. A symbolical representation of expiation by substitutionary punishment in these sacrifices would leave them destitute of *any moral drawing power*, and impart to them an aspect at once terrifying and repellent. The sacrifices were evidently designed to allure and instruct: they constituted a system of means for the religious education of the people "in righteousness and true holiness."

Cross would be denuded of its converting power. The practice has long since ceased, with all intelligent preachers, of seeking to save souls by a careful display of God as an avenger. Philosophy unites with religion in condemning the pulpit policy which points out the gate of Heaven through the gorge of a horrible Hell. The frightening process of preaching has been proved faulty; for people have only been kept near the kingdom of Heaven so long as some powerful external stimulant, some shriek from the bottomless pit, has reached their terror-stricken ear. The ligature of love reaching from the throne of God and the Lamb could alone bind their hearts in willing captivity to the skies, and this has been wanting. To compensate this felt deficiency in the popular presentation of the death of Christ, much effort has been made to distil the elixir of love out of the distorted Cross of the churches. What learned labor has been expended to dissipate the dark clouds of Divine wrath, that the sunshine of Divine complacency might be seen behind! But the people have heard the thunder and seen the vivid lightning; and such thunder and lightning as have destroyed their violated senses so that the sweet, still tones of love they cannot hear, and the light of God's complacency shines for them in vain. The distillation of infinite compassion out of omnipotent wrath, and a ready pardon out of a most relentless punishment, belongs to a chemistry too curious for the common people. The Professor may be satisfied, but the people are enveloped in confusion: they cannot understand, and therefore they are uninfluenced. The real moral force of the popular gospel,—the love of God,—is too far in the rear to reach the human heart. It can only be seen at all through the black clouds of heavy judicial wrath, and then so vaguely, so occasionally, —just as the thick volumes part for a moment with their dreadful density,—that it is hardly distinguishable as love, except to the practised or professional eye. Love would be never sought there but for the positive assurances of the professional guide that it is there. It is so unlike the calm, quiet abode of love, it is that locality of wrathful noise and tumult. It is wonderful that piety lives at all under a system that is almost practically destitute of the moral power which the wisdom of God has implanted in the very bosom of the true gospel.—"God is Love, and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God and God in him." And Christ is the manifestation of God,—that is, the manifestation of Love, and hence he is the power of God and the wisdom of God for the conversion and salvation of men.

Our inquiry contemplates the development of the true moral significancy of the Cross of Christ, apart, so far as this is possible, from the warping influences of controversy. We shall state our own convictions of what the Bible teaches concerning that great fact,—the death of Christ,—which, in common with all Christians, we believe has a doctrinal import of the very first importance to the Christian religion. We cannot overlook the fact that here the Saviour's thoughts most commonly converged,—that it was a peculiarly solemn topic of his private conversations with the twelve,—and that, after its occurrence, it entered largely into the public discourses and epistolary writings of the Apostles, and became the grand theme of their apostolic ministry. The death of Christ gave birth to a most significant phraseology, and imparted largely to the vocabulary of primitive preaching.—Indeed, the entire system of Christianity is comprehensively spoken of in Scripture under the term *Cross*,—"the preaching of the Cross." "We preach Christ *crucified*," says the apostle. We remember the words of our Lord,—"And I *if I be lifted up from the earth* will draw all men unto me," signifying in this language, as we are told on an Evangelist's authority, "what death he should suffer."—We forget not the anxious solicitude of the apostle to the Gentiles, "lest the *cross* of Christ should be made of none effect;" how he exhorted his converts, if need be, to "suffer persecution for the *cross* of Christ;" how sympathetically he alluded to "the offence of the *cross*;" and how magnanimously he exclaimed, "God forbid that I should glory save in the *cross* of our Lord Jesus Christ." We read, in apostolic phraseology, of "enemies of the *cross* of Christ,"—of "peace through the blood of the *cross*," —and reconciliation "in one body by the *cross*."—This sacred technicality implies a doctrinal pre-eminence for the Cross in the system of Apostolical Christianity. It is unquestionably a great primary fact, involving in itself most important moral and doctrinal significance. What its significance is, is the ultimate end of our inquiry. And in prosecuting this inquiry, it will behove us to ask how the Cross ever became identified with the history of the Lord Jesus Christ; in other words, how came it to pass that Christ was put to this violent and, in those times, disgraceful death? Our course of inquiry needs to pursue an historic direction. But it will be necessary that we should raise the previous question,—Wherefore Christ was manifested on the stage of human life at all? before we can rightly interpret the doctrine of the Cross. The Cross is the last link in a long chain of antecedents and consequents, and we need to go back, link by link, through this chain to ascertain what causes were in operation to bring about this solemn issue. Thus far the inquiry is simply historical, and the Evangelists, as the historians of Christ's life and death, will be the sources of our information.—*Chris. Examiner, Eng.*

(*To be Continued.*)

CHRIST THE BREAD OF LIFE.

AN EXPOSITION.

"I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world."—John 6: 51.

These words are charged with the most precious meaning, and it is our intention to enter fully, though briefly, into an examination of them. Without any preliminary observations, we request the reader to observe first, the character in which Jesus here represents himself—"I am the living bread which came down from heaven." The parties to whom our Saviour thus addressed himself, had required from him some miraculous display of divine power, as an evidence that he was in reality what he professed to be—a messenger from God; and they supported their demand by referring to the circumstance of their fathers having been miraculously fed in the wilderness by the hand of Moses

—"Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat." Jesus replied to their request by asserting that God had given them a blessing of far superior value, and that he himself was this transcendant gift. "My Father giveth you the *true* bread from heaven: *I* am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever."

The phrase, "from heaven" is equivalent to—"from God;" hence he styles himself "the bread of God," the bread of God's providing. It was God who, in the fullness of his compassion, sent his well beloved Son into this world that we might not perish but have everlasting life.

When Jesus represents himself as "bread," he plainly intimates that one grand object of his mission was to *give life.* The only use of bread is to sustain life. The moment bread is deprived of its life-preserving quality—the moment it fails to communicate nutriment—that instant it becomes void of all worth. It follows, then, that the only proper mark of analogy between Christ and bread consists in his being the source of life to all who receive him as their Saviour. It is commonly thought that the Lord Jesus is not the source of life to believers; that men will remain in being perpetually, let their conduct be what it may; that it is not as the communicator of everlasting life, but of everlasting happiness, that he is self-styled "the bread of life."—Such a doctrine is not only unwarranted by the Saviour's teachings, it is directly opposite to it. The property of bread is not to communicate happiness, for how many at this hour have abundance of bread, and continue in wretchedness! Life, not happiness, is the product of bread; and it is because Jehovah has constituted his Son the giver of Immortality to all who obey him, that, in the passage before us, he designates himself "the bread of life." This will appear more obvious when we attend to the remainder of the verse.

The expression, "living bread," may be understood as descriptive of the superior *quality* of this God-given food, to the manna referred to by the Jews as having been provided for their ancestors in the wilderness. This is evident from what we find in verses 49th and 50th—"Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and *are dead.* This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof *and not die.*" The superiority of the bread of which Jesus discoursed, consists in this, that it not merely preserves life, it imparts everlasting being. The Jews addressed by our Lord thought only of supplies for the present existence; his grand aim was to elevate their aspirations to a life beyond this state of things,—a life that would not end its periods in the horrors of dissolution; one, in short, that would be as enduring as the fountain of being himself. Hence the great Teacher declares, "I am the living," i. e., the life-giving "bread, which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread he shall *live for ever.*" In the remainder of the passage Jesus continues to speak of himself as the life-giving One—"The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." We are not to understand by these words, that it was merely by rendering up a part of himself that he was to bring eternal life within the reach of dying men. By his "flesh" he evidently meant *himself;* for in verses 35 and 48, as well as in the one before us, he plainly affirms that he himself is the bread of life. This appears still more plain when we compare his language in the 54th verse, and what he delivers in verse 57. In the one verse he says that "all who eat his flesh shall have eternal life;" in the other, that "as the living Father had sent him, and he lived by the Father, in the same manner they who ate him should live by him." The flesh of Jesus, then, is Jesus himself; and when he intimates that he would give his "flesh," he taught his hearers that he would give *himself* for the life of the world.

The two parts of the verse, then, exhibit the same truth, that Jesus is the bringer in of life to a death-doomed race. Still, we are inclined to view the second part of the verse as in some measure explanatory of the first part. Jesus in the first place states the fact, that he is life-giving bread sent from God, that all might eat and live for ever; and then he describes the process by which he becomes the source of life, or endless being to guilty men, viz.,—by giving his flesh, rendering up himself to death, for the life of the world.

Herein, indeed, is love! Reader! will you contemplate it with earnestness? Jesus gave *himself* for you, and what more could he give? The whole world lies in wickedness, and on that account is worthy of everlasting destruction—for "the wages of sin is death;" but the Lord from heaven, in boundless compassion, "gave himself a ransom for all." He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, from which God speedily raised him up and gave him glory. He rose victorious over death, the first fruits of them that slept. In receiving him as our Saviour, and being reconciled unto God through the influence of his love, we become heirs of unending being: we may rejoice in hope of Immortality. This hope will be realized at his coming, when his people are to be ransomed from the grave, and fashioned like unto his own glorious person.

And now, reader, permit the inquiry, What think you of Christ? What think you of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ? Think, O! think of his love till your heart melts in tenderness within you, and tears of contrition and gratitude flow from your eyes! Listen how he calls you in tones of the most moving accents, while pointing to the Son of his love who expired for your sins, he exclaims, "TURN YE, TURN YE, WHY WILL YE DIE?"
—*Expositor,* [*Edinburgh, Scotland.*] W. L.

DEATH IN SCRIPTURE.

(DR. LAW, BISHOP OF CARLISLE.)

It will be necessary to attend to the true meaning of the word DEATH, as it is strictly and properly applied in Scripture; and this may be best seen, by looking back to the remarkable passage where it is first used, in that denunciation which brought Adam and his posterity under it; and where we must suppose it used in all the plainness and propriety of speech imaginable. And, accordingly, we find the original here, as full and emphatical as words can make it. They are translated,—Thou shalt *surely;* but might with more strictness have been ren-

dered,—Thou shalt *utterly die ;* which one would think sufficiently explained in the sentence passed on our first parents, where they are reminded of their original, and of that state to which this change should reduce them. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground, for out of it wast thou taken; dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Now what do we imagine they could possibly understand by this denunciation but a resumption of that natural life or conscious being, which their Creator had been lately pleased to bestow upon them? the forfeiting which must necessarily include a total loss of all those benefits that then did, or ever could proceed from him? This surely, and nothing less, must be implied in that most solemn sentence; nor can we well conceive the unhappy subjects of it to have been at that time so very ingenious as to explain it away by distinguishing upon the several component parts of their constitution, and concluding, that by death no more was intended than only a separation of these parts, while the principle of them was still living in some different manner, or that it was a continuation of their consciousness and real existence, though in some other place. No, *this was the philosophy of after ages;* concerning which, all I shall say at present is, that some of its most eminent patrons cannot help observing, that they "do not find it in the Scriptures."* These, in their obvious meaning, represent the *whole* man, individual, person, or being, as included in the sentence addressed to him; nor do they seem to take notice of any other circumstance in the case, beside that, so often mentioned, of his returning to the "dust, or ground from whence he was taken;" and might not the first pair as well expect, that the same "breath of life, which the Lord God had breathed into their nostrils, whereby man became a living soul," should still survive the execution of that sentence, or that the dust itself should praise God; as that any kind of knowledge of, or communication with him, should continue in that state of darkness and destruction to which they were then doomed?"—*From Sermon on* Heb. 2: 14, 15, "Forasmuch then," &c.; *Carlisle Edition*, 1784.

* TILLOTSON, vol. ii. Ser 100.—This is very tenderly expressed; and the reason which that great author gives for it, is not unsuitable to the prejudices of his time; whereas, if he had considered the point more fully, I presume he would have found the Scripture NOT TAKING THIS NATURAL IMMORTALITY FOR GRANTED; but rather laying down THE CONTRARY; and the New Testament everywhere insisting on it, as the very ground of the whole Christian covenant, through which alone we attain to immortality or EVERLASTING LIFE.

o

CHASTISEMENT AND PUNISHMENT.—"Chastisement has entirely the improvement of the pupil for its object; punishment the actual manifestation that the majesty of the law has not been really injured by rebellion against it.....Chastisement, *as such*, has its end entirely in the individual subject; punishment, *as such*,—for it is a matter self-evident that it may unite with itself the element of chastisement—has to maintain the universal against the individual.....As to the *Divine punishment*, its real design can so much the less be the improvement of the punished, since this, indeed, is just the end of *redemption*, regarded in the full truth of its notion. If now punishment were means adapted to this end, redemption would not be requisite, or rather inversely,—if this end is to be attained by redemption, what purpose is answered by severe means of punishment? or are we thus, perhaps, to conceive of the relation, that when redemption is not able to effect the improvement of man, he must be brought to this end by punishment? But then it would follow that punishment is a more powerful means of regeneration than redemption."—*The Christian Doctrine of Sin. From the German of Dr. J. Muller.*

o

FROM DR. I. F. LEE, NORTH CAROLINA.

Meltonsville, Anson County, N. C., March 12, '53.

BR. STORRS:—I send you the minutes of the Moriah Baptist Association, &c., &c.; and invite your attention to the "*Circular*," by the Clerk, W. F. Brasington, who is accounted about the ablest Theologian in the Association. The *Circular* will at once show you how well he deserves the character of an able minister. You have long since been convinced of the fact, that this *religious* body set themselves up as judges of orthodoxy, and have long ago pronounced as heretical and subversive of the Christian religion, these words of David, "*All the wicked will he destroy.*" You will find that they exercise the power to dissolve churches, (page 5,) &c. Perhaps it may not be prudent to say, *that the Circular is exceedingly faulty and puerile; and that the composition is destitute alike of correctness, elegance, or clearness.* But in as much as the Association holds themselves ex-officio sound judges of doctrine, it may be not only compatible with truth, but charity itself, to apprize them of their error, and make them sensible of the *gross stolidity* under which they must have labored, when they approved the *Circular*, and ordered it to be published—thereby endorsing its sentiments and proclaiming them aloud, as sound and orthodox. It is no difficult matter to do this, if they will only hear the truth, and understand the meaning of those sentiments, which the *Circular* has declared as the work of God! but which, in reality, are about as *insane fancies*, and as mischievous puerilities as ever entered into the heart of *infidelity* itself. Let the *Circular* come forward and justify what is now said.

1st. "God hath inscribed IMMANUEL on the world's tablet."—p. 8.

2d. "*An apostate world*" is endowed "with the necessary and appropriate means of communicating *the immortal boon* of heavenly unity."—p. 8.

3d. "*The heavenly, the immortal boon* is given to an *apostate world.*"—p. 8.

Perhaps the literary, and the religious, may conclude that the foregoing sentiments are so preposterous, impious, and absurd, that no sane man ever could have written them—and that no religious society could approve them. Nevertheless, they were read, approved, and published by the Baptist Moriah Association.—Oct. 2d–4th, 1852.—Sugar Creek Church, York District, S. C.

Now, my dear brother, when you shall have read the Circular, and impartially examined it, you will easily form an opinion of the true character of those who pronounce the *destruction* of the wicked, *heresy*—exclude from their fellowship all who believe that God will destroy the wicked!! And

yet this learned body, 15 *ordained ministers, and* 45 *lay delegates, assert* that God has given an immortal boon to an *apostate world*, and, at the same time, all power necessary to communicate it!!!—An apostate world then is safe (!!) if 15 Baptist ministers and 45 Baptist delegates are judges of orthodoxy—of sound doctrine. It would seem this doctrine constitutes an essential item in the faith of a regular Baptist Church. This is not very encouraging to poor Christians, who, by patient continuance in well-doing, must seek for honor, glory, immortality, eternal life, when it is declared by all the Theologians of the Moriah Baptist Association, that an *apostate world* has already received the *immortal boon*, and power to communicate it? If this is so, then it is better to apply at once to an apostate world, and receive an immortal boon without any farther delay! *No wonder* these self-styled divines pronounce the destruction of an *apostate world*, heretical and subversive of the Christian religion—since they believed that apostates, or an apostate world, or a world of apostates, have already received the *heavenly*, the immortal boon.

I shall say nothing about the harvest of which the Circular speaks—the field of human nature, *white, not black*, with iniquity—no, no, the copious crop of all the evil passions *is white!* white sins!! and an apostate world has received the heavenly, the immortal boon!! Gracious God, have mercy upon us, and save us from folly.

Well, my brother, have you ever, in all your religious experience and observation, seen any thing equal to this Circular? My God, grant that my pity and compassion be according to truth and charity—for I am not only almost but altogether sick at heart when I consider the state of things in the Association. It is lamentable—I cannot, I dare not account for many things I see. I dare not judge that which I do not know—that which I cannot see and comprehend. But if the tree is to be judged by its fruits, such fruits as the Circular speaks of as a copious crop whitening!—you may form some righteous judgment of the existing evils within the bounds of the Association. Surely if we had no private distress of our own, no sorrow, no tribulation of our own—the very state of society should, nay would be to us a source of pity and lamentation.

In hope of eternal life, &c. J. F. Lee.

The work of "*dissolving* a church," that Dr. Lee speaks of, was by the following "Report," adopted by the Association, viz:

"We find that the Bulah Church is such that we, after mature reflection and careful investigation, feel ourselves under the disagreeable necessity of recommending that said church be dissolved, and that a suitable missionary be appointed, with evangelical powers to gather up such persons as he may deem suitable to be constituted into a regular Baptist Church."

Admirable "rooting up of tares." How much thanks they will receive from the head of the church, "in the time of the harvest," for their disobedience to his authority, "the day will reveal."

The "Bulah Church," if we understand the matter, was too well saturated with the Scripture doctrine of "*life* only through Christ" to be controled by the traditions of men; hence, must be *dissolved* by the "*Baptist* Association." We are of opinion that the Great Head of the Church will *dissolve* all the *sectarian* churches soon.

The "apostate world," to which was "given the necessary and appropriate means of communicating the immortal boon of heavenly unity," is thus described in the Circular, first part of the same paragraph:

"Sin hath sown the seed of discord, broad-cast through the whole field of human nature, and everywhere the field is whitening to harvest, yielding a copious harvest of Envy, Anger, Wrath, Malice, Hatred, Revenge, Dissention, and Division. The whole world lieth in wickedness."

We have given place to the foregoing that our friends might see the state of affairs abroad, and be stirred up to send out the true light. The nominal churches and the world, alike, disregard the authority of Christ, and have set up their own wills and traditions instead thereof. While we deal plainly with them let us strive to show to all that we are actuated by another spirit. May those who are now in darkness soon see the *great light* of Life only through Jesus.

Errata.—In *Bible vs. Tradition* read as follows: Page 89, line 22, for "intended" read *intends;* same page, line 25, for "undiluted" read *diluted.* Page 104, 1st line, for "have already," read *could have.* Page 125, line 24, transpose the word "to" from the left hand of the line to the right hand. Page 145, line 19, for "and" read *ana.* Page 171, line 17, for "solid," read *sordid.* Page 247, 8th line from bottom, for "Here," read *There.* Page 264, line 6, for "axion" read *axiom.* Page 282, line 3, for "therefore" read *therefor.* Page 289, line 12, for "anointment" read *ointment.* Last page, in price of works, 3d line from bottom, for $250 read $2.50.

THE SLEEP OF HOPE.

BY ALFRED TENNYSON, POET LAUREATE.

God gives us love! Something to love
He lends us; but, when love is grown
To ripeness, that on which it throve
Falls off, and Love is left alone.

* * * *

Sleep sweetly, tender heart, in peace:
Sleep, holy Spirit, blessed Soul,
While the stars burn, the moons increase,
And the great ages onward roll!

Sleep till the end, true soul and sweet.
Nothing comes to thee new or strange,
Sleep full of rest from head to feet,
Lie still, dry dust, secure of change.

[*Communicated by Dr. Lees, England.*

gh Christ" to be con-
men; hence, must be
Association." We are
ad of the Church will
urches soon.
which was "given the
ans of communicating
ly unity," is thus de-
part of the same para-

of discord, broad-cast
man nature, and every-
to harvest, yielding a
Anger, Wrath, Malice,
, and Division. The
ess."

he foregoing that our
affairs abroad, and be
e light. The nominal
ke, disregard the au-
et up their own wills
of. While we deal
e to show to all that
pirit. May those who
see the *great light* of

Tradition read as fol-
r "intended" read *in-*
for "undiluted" read
, for "have already,"
25, line 24, transpose
hand of the line to the
ie 19, for "and" read
"solid," read *sordid.*
ttom, for "Here," read
"axion" read *axiom.*
erefore" read *therefor.*
nointment" read *oint-*
of works, 3d line from
).

OF HOPE.

POET LAUREATE.

mething to love
hen love is grown
ich it throve
s left alone.

* *

ieart, in peace:
essed Soul,
he moons increase,
onward roll!

soul and sweet.
iee new or strange,
head to feet,
ecure of change.

Dr. Lees, England.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VIII. NEW YORK, JULY, 1853. NO. 7

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 140 Fulton-street, (Up Stairs.)
TERMS.--Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

PROBATIONARY STATE OF MEN.

We give the following excellent remarks from the Introduction of Dr. McCulloh's work, pp. 21—24. We commend them to the careful attention of our readers.

"Nothing is more distinctly inferable from the Scripture writings, than that Jehovah has placed mankind in the present life in a PROBATIONARY STATE, and consequently that fact constitutes the key to the intellectual comprehension of every particular pertaining to the providential appointments of Jehovah respecting mankind whilst they are fulfilling such a condition of being. This must be evident to the least reflection, for if Jehovah, who has created all things from nothing by his omnipotent power, has also placed mankind in a state of intellectual and moral probation, he must have necessarily constituted every other phenomenon implicated with mankind to be harmonious with the fact of their being in a state of trial and self-discipline.

"As to the theory of human probation, no one ought for a moment to fall into the gross absurdity of supposing that it is to operate in any manner upon the divine mind, as if informing him who among mankind would suit his ulterior object or purposes. The theory of human probation is simply this, that as Jehovah has made mankind intellectual and moral free agents, so he has required of them that they shall attain as such to a certain relative perfection through their own exertions and voluntary self-discipline. There is no mystery whatever in the matter; Jehovah instead of making mankind at once suitable for his ulterior purposes, as he could have done with a mere word, has seen fit to require of them as intellectual and moral free agents, that they shall attain to the required degree of perfection through their own exertions. To induce human action in this particular God has announced to mankind through the Scripture writings, that he will bestow eternal life and happiness upon those who will qualify themselves, and if they will not do so he has distinctly announced that he will reject and destroy them.

"Though the Christian world, generally speaking, have correct views as to the probationary condition of mankind in its practical or personal requirements from them as free agents, it is wonderful how few understand the phenomena necessarily implicated in such a condition of things.

"If mankind have been placed by their Creator in a probationary state, in which as intellectual and moral free agents they are to attain to a required amount of perfection through their own voluntary action, the following conditions of things are essential to such an object:

"*First.* The world we inhabit as the platform upon which our self-discipline is to be accomplished, must be of such a constitution as shall call into action those energies by or through which our self-discipline is to be effected. If our earth and all mundane phenomena had been made perfect, *i. e.* if every inconvenience was removed, and all things tended only to the exaltation of human happiness, how could there have been any probationary discipline in such a case?

"*Secondly.* If we are to attain to a relative perfection in righteousness, holiness, temperance, patience, &c. through our own action and voluntary self-discipline, mankind must necessarily be free to act, whether in doing what is wrong or in doing what is right, for it is only through the phenomena of such a condition of things that perfection can be attained as the act of our free agency. If men, therefore, are necessarily free to do either right or wrong, all the phenomena of *evil doing* must be evidently inseparable from the probationary condition of intellectual and moral free agents.

"Yet evident as the inference ought to be, this very imperfection which must necessarily characterize a probationary state, constitutes that wonderful perplexity concerning MORAL AND PHYSICAL EVIL that has puzzled mankind from the earliest times down to the present day. If any Christian will regard the subject but for a moment, he ought to perceive that the development of intellectual and moral creatures, who are to be influenced as free agents by a proposed reward or punishment, could not possibly be effected but by their being placed in an *imperfect*, or *evil state*, for the terms are mere synonymes.

"From the same consideration of mankind's probationary state it equally follows, that though Jehovah be absolutely omnipotent, omniscient, and infinitely perfect in every attribute of wisdom and goodness, yet he could not sensibly manifest those perfections in his superintendence of the affairs of this world without destroying human free agency. For since Jehovah has determined that mankind shall attain to their perfection through their own voluntary action, so any direct or sensible interference of God in his infinite power or attributes would destroy human free agency either in degree or totally, according to such interference. I do not mean to say that God never interferes by his providence in the affairs of individuals or nations; what I assert is, that when he does so, he accomplishes his purposes either secretly or through the instrumentality of secondary causes, and not by sensible interferences, unless on those occasions that are termed miraculous, and which in their extreme

rarity distinctly shews that Jehovah does not sensibly interfere in the regulation of human affairs.

"The clear discernment of this necessary peculiarity as to Jehovah's non-intervention towards mankind during their probationary condition, is of all other principles the most important to be understood in estimating the true character of the Scripture writings, for without we comprehend his peculiar attitude towards mankind as creatures in a probationary condition, we shall be plunged into inextricable perplexities in consequence of our belief in his absolute omnipotence and omniscience. A single statement may be sufficient to convince the reader of the correctness of what we have just remarked. Among the many enactments of the Law of Moses are a number of minute regulations under the immediate sanction of Jehovah, that were calculated to preserve the Jewish people from being infected by the leprosy. All these regulations in themselves are apparently inconsistent with the infinite power or goodness of Jehovah; for it is immediately suggested to our minds, why, as being omnipotent, did he not exempt the Jews from the disease, or else inform them how it might be readily cured. It must be evident, however, from such a query, that if Jehovah was to manifest his omnipotence according to this requirement, he ought also to remove every other inconvenience, however trivial it may be, that pertains to our present condition. In other words, we would get rid of the very phenomena essential to a state of probationary self-discipline, for if all the inconveniences of human life were removed, in what would our probation consist?

"Again, in utter oversight of the circumstance that Jehovah, according to the Scriptures, requires mankind to attain to their perfection through their own voluntary action, the deists have objected, and many Christians have been perplexed to understand why mankind should be required to pray to God for things which he knows better than ourselves what is most suitable for us. The reason of the requirement is as plain as day light. Jehovah does not propose to make us to suit his ultimate purposes by the exercise of his omnipotence, he has left it to ourselves to become what we please, under the inducements of obtaining either an everlasting life, or of incurring an absolute rejection and condemnation.

"But though this great work is to be accomplished by ourselves, Jehovah has at the same time promised to help those who will *pray to him, i. e.* ask his assistance. Jehovah, therefore, will help men to attain to perfection, but he will not do their work for them; he assists them as far as they ask his assistance, and no further.* If God intended to make men perfect by his omnipotence, he would not have placed them in a state of trial.

"The solution of all similar queries is to be found in the fact of our probationary condition. Jehovah in his wisdom and omnipotence has established a certain condition of mundane phenomena that are essential to, or harmonious with the probationary condition of mankind, and which are to continue permanently until his purposes shall be accomplished. We are therefore not to estimate his attributes or providence in the superintendence of earthly things by the standard of his absolute nature and infinite perfections, however much we believe in them abstractedly, but according to the peculiarities of the scheme through which he has determined mankind shall as free agents accomplish the development that he anticipates from their action as moral and intellectual creatures.*

---

count for this, as they suppose that Jehovah, in bestowing wisdom and skill upon Solomon, also *prevented him* by his grace, and therefore they are greatly puzzled to find that history essentially represents him as a worldly-minded, voluptuous man, who had little, and sometimes no regard towards Jehovah.

The simple truth of the matter is, that Solomon, notwithstanding the great intellectual discernment he received from Jehovah, was unaffected in his probationary condition by that circumstance, and was required to attain to moral perfection, like all other men, by personal self discipline. Now there is no evidence from the Scriptures to infer that Solomon ever sought grace or assistance from God to enable him to attain to righteousness and personal holiness. Jehovah, therefore, never operated on his heart, because Solomon never asked such help, and consequently he continued a merely intellectually wise or philosophical king, who availed himself of whatever was in his power for gratification; presumably on the ground that he only did what pertained to his royal prerogative. Solomon's history, therefore, I apprehend, shews conclusively, that although Jehovah may bestow all other gifts or endowments upon individuals, yet he never bestows the grace that leads to perfection in righteousness and holiness, but to those who seek that assistance from him by personal application in earnest prayer.

* It was undoubtedly to this principle that Moses alludes, when he told the Jews, (*Deut.* vi. 16.) "thou shalt not tempt Jehovah thy God." In other words, that they must not anticipate any intervention of Jehovah whenever they might see fit to appeal to his omnipotence. They were to fulfil their duties under the appointments of existing phenomena, and must not expect that the circumstances under which they were placed should be dispensed with or modified, because Jehovah had the power to do so if he pleased. Our Saviour applies this text expressly to such a doctrine in his answer (*Math.* iv. 6, 7.) to the temptation proposed by Satan.

* We have a distinct exposition of the manner of Jehovah's proceeding towards individuals afforded us in the history of Solomon. On his accession to the throne he had a remarkable dream, in which God appeared to him and told him to ask what he would. (*I Kings*, iii. 5, *&c.*) Solomon asked for wisdom and skill to govern his people, and which we are told (verse 10, &c.,) was so pleasing to God that he promised him not only an intellectual discernment above all other men, but also riches and honor, that he had forborne to ask.

But notwithstanding this great gift of wisdom and understanding, Solomon's character will be found very low in the moral and religious scale. The theologians for the most part have been perplexed to ac-

HUMAN MATERIALISM.

BY WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, SCOTLAND.

The fact that human Personality in Scripture is associated with materialism, is one that ought not to be overlooked; moreover, it is one that an attentive reader of the Book may without difficulty confirm to his perfect satisfaction. No doubt this has been plainly manifested already, still, we think, an arrangement of a few passages, noting in them

by *italic* types the words with which personality is conveyed, may furnish additional confirmation to those who have been impressed from the foregoing chapters with the corporeal or organic basis of personality in the Word, and be, as it were, a key to the understanding of all similar texts.

I. *Personality is conjoined directly or indirectly with "dust."*

Gen. 2: 7, The Lord God formed *man* of the *dust of the ground*," &c. Compare with this, v. 22, "And the *rib*, which the Lord God had taken from man made he a woman," &c. 3: 19, "*Dust thou* art," &c. 18: 27, "Behold now, I (Abraham) have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord, which am but *dust* and ashes." Job 10: 9, "Remember, I beseech thee, that thou hast made *me* as the clay; and wilt thou bring me into *dust* again"? 34: 15, "*Man* shall turn again unto *dust*." Psalms 103: 14, "He remembereth that *we* are *dust*," &c. 146: 4, "His breath (of life) goeth forth; *he* returneth to *his earth*," &c. Ecc. 3: 20, "All are of the *dust*," &c. 12: 7, "Then shall the *dust* return to the earth as it was; and the spirit (of life) shall return unto God who gave it."

II. *Personality is conjoined with "clay," and "blood."*

Job 33: 6, "*I* also am formed out of the *clay*." Isaiah 64: 8, "*We* are the *clay*," &c. Acts 17: 26, "Hath made of *one blood* all nations of *men*."

III. *Personality is conjoined, very frequently, with "flesh"*

Gen. 6: 3, "*Man . . is flesh*." 6: 12, "All *flesh* had corrupted his way." 6: 13, "The end of all *flesh*." 9: 11, "Neither shall all *flesh* be cut off any more." Numbers 16: 22, "The God of the spirits of all *flesh*." Psalms 65: 2, "Unto thee shall all *flesh* come." 56: 4, "I will not fear what *flesh* can do unto me." 78: 39, "they were but" (or only) "*flesh*." 145: 21, "Let all *flesh* bless his holy name." Isaiah 40: 5, "All *flesh* shall see it together." Jeremiah 17: 5, "Cursed be the man that . . . maketh *flesh* his arm." 25: 31, "He will plead with all *flesh*." Matthew 24: 22, "There should no *flesh* be saved." Romans 3: 20, "by the deeds of law there shall no *flesh* be justified." 1 Cor. 1: 29, "that no *flesh* should glory in his presence." Galatians 2: 16, "by the works of the law shall no *flesh* be justified."

IV. *Personality is conjoined with "flesh and blood."*

Matthew 16: 17, "*flesh* and *blood* (man) hath not revealed it unto thee." 1 Cor. 15: 50, "*flesh* and *blood* (man unspiritualized, see v. 44,) cannot inherit the Kingdom of God." Gal. 1: 16, "I conferred not with *flesh* and *blood*;" (i. e. with no man). Eph. 6: 12. "we wrestle not against *flesh* and *blood*." Heb. 2: 14, "For as much then as the children are partakers of *flesh* and *blood* (were men) he also himself likewise took part of the same" (appeared as a man).

V. *Personality is conjoined with "body."*

Psalms 139: 15, "My *substance* (margin, 'body'—i. e. *I*) was not hid from thee when *I* was made in secret" (in the womb). Matt. 5: 29, "not that thy whole *body* (i. e. *person*) should be cast into hell." 6: 22, "the light of the *body* (person) is the eye . . . thy whole *body* (person) shall be full of light." 6: 25, "nor yet for your *body* (person) what *ye* shall put on." Rom. 1: 24, "to dishonor their own *bodies* (themselves) between themselves." 8: 23, "waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our *body*" (i. e. our redemption). 12: 1, "present your *bodies*." (i. e. yourselves). 1 Cor. 9: 27, "I keep under my *body* (myself) . . . lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, *I myself* should be a cast-away." 15: 44, "It is sown a natural *body*;" i. e. the men spoken of lie down in the grave soulical—"it is raised a spiritual body;" i. e. the men spoken of rise spiritual beings.

The Apostle is not speaking of the resurrection of bodies in the popular acceptation, as distinguished from souls or spirits; he discourses concerning the resurrection of *men*, as may be seen from the preceding part of the chapter, for instance, verse 18, "then (if Christ be not raised) *they* also (the MEN, and not parts of them) which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished;" and verse 22, "as in Adam all die (all the MEN he is speaking of), even so in Christ shall all (the same *persons*) be made alive." Hence he goes on in the next verse thus, "but every MAN in his own order," &c.

Gal. 6: 17, "I bear in my *body* (i. e. person) the marks of (or for) the Lord Jesus." Eph. 5: 28, "So ought men to love their wives as their own *bodies;*" (i. e. as themselves). Phil. 1: 20, "Christ shall be magnified in my *body* (i. e. in me) whether by life or by death." 3: 21, "who shall change our vile *body* (or self) that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious *body*." (or self). Heb. 10: 5, "a *body* (entire humanity) hast thou prepared me." 10: 10, "we are sanctified through the offering of the *body* of Jesus" (i. e. through the offering of Jesus). James 2: 26, "For as the *body* (the man) without the spirit (margin, "breath") is dead." 3: 6, "the tongue . . . defileth the whole *body*," (or person.)

POPULAR ASSUMPTIONS WITH BRIEF REPLIES.

I. It is asserted that thought is not a property of matter. If this means a table, a stone and an apple cannot think, we find no fault with the statement; but if it means that animalized *living* matter, for instance brain, cannot evolve mental phenomena, we ask the proof. Has the Creator said so? Is it a self-evident proposition that Omnipotence cannot cause animalized and organized living matter to judge, reason, love, and hate? When it is demonstrated that this is impossible, and, that it is impossible, nothing less than the testimony of God himself can be accepted as final proof, it will be time to pass on in quest of a *second* cause to explain the existing results, both, we may say, in relation to man and the lower animals. The philosophic rule of Sir Isaac Newton, in obeying which he made his grand physical discoveries, is most applicable here, "'When *one* cause is sufficient to account for an effect, no more are to be admitted.'"

To all appearance, judging from the development of brain, and the corresponding mental functions or results,—from the facts of madness, either complete or partial,—from idiotcy, and from the suspension of consciousness by pressure on the brain, and many other circumstances,—we say, judging from all these, there appears to be ground, broad and firm, for the conclusion to rise upon, that thought, passion, desire, and the like, as naturally proceed from matter when it assumes the form of brain, as perfume arises from it when it exists in the form of a rose, or galvanism when it coheres in

the form and subject to the arrangements of the battery. To all appearance this is the case, and, since it is the product of Heaven's power, it must be an infinitely wise ordination, and on our part it is the office of piety to acknowledge the device of his wonder-working hands.

In asserting that brain thinks, &c., in man and the lower tribes, we do not wish to be misunderstood, for, strictly speaking, it is not the brain of a man, but rather the living being man himself, that thinks and wills by his brain. A brain by itself, that is, disjoined from the human system of which it is only a part, cannot act in this way, any more than feet can walk, or lungs breathe, or ears hear, or a stomach digest; but if we rightly consider we will discover, as already suggested, that the proper view of the matter is this, that it is the creature man who walks by his feet, breathes by his lungs, &c.; and the being man is a compound of these organs, with many more, capable of executing the various mechanical, physiological, mental or cerebral functions, peculiar to his order of animated existence.

2. We are told man's spirit thinks. We answer, it is quite an assumption that he has a spirit such as he is supposed to possess; it is another that a spirit must be a living substance, and that, if even alive, thought must be among its attributes. Who, with an authority that we may not wisely and virtuously question declares that man's spirit thinks, and wills, and desires? When will the distinction be drawn between a man and the spirit of a man?—between the life-giving breath and the Breather?

3. It is asserted that the man and his outward material parts are entirely different, as may be detected in the phraseology, *my* hands, *my* feet, *my* head, *my* eyes, &c.; the "my," it is affirmed, is the "spirit" on its throne within owning these as its organs or members, and this spirit is alone worthy of being called the man. Well, if this reasoning is solid, what originates the *my*, or what is it that says *my*, in the expressions "MY soul, MY spirit?" If the "*my* hands," for instance, prove these members do not essentially belong to the human being, but are, as it were, accidentally conjoined with him in the meantime, then the *my* soul and *my* spirit prove the same as to the popular "soul" and "spirit;" and if a man is not a corporeal agent, nor a soul, nor a spirit, what is he? Every orthodox believer in the common doctrine about the human spirit, uses parallel phraseology to that on which such stress is fallaciously placed, when he speaks, as every one must do, of *his* reason, *his* will, *his* imagination, *his* desire. How very absurd to demand, is there a being different from this reason, will, imagination, and desire, who yet owns them all, and employs them to gain his ends? If the evidence is good in the first case, it is equally powerful in the second. A little reflection, we respectfully submit, would convince most persons of the language we have presented being just that of a human agent announcing property in his own members, parts, faculties, and in himself. If we say *my* hands, we also say my-self, and the being who underlies the *my* is the same being who underlies and originates the *self*. It is in fact a "self" claiming property in a "self"—a man declaring himself to belong to himself. The divine being is an absolute unity, yet he says "my soul," and is not the soul of God, just, the Eternal himself? When he uses the words "my soul" the phraseology is equal to *I*, as is detectable in the verse, "my soul," or *I*, "shall have no pleasure in him."

4. Men, it is again affirmed, will live for ever because they are spirits. Who has not heard the language, "a spirit cannot die?" Now we beg to answer, that the Bible no where declares man to be a spirit, and the same book never asserts that a spirit must live for ever. Angels are spirits, and who would suspend their duration on the order, or kind of being conferred on them, and not on the will, and power, and promise of the Supreme.

5. Men are in the image of God, and therefore they must be spirits. Where is this laid down in the Book, from which, of course, it is professedly derived? So far from God making man a spirit, when he produced him in his image, the Record instructs us, he was formed of the "dust of the ground." Gen. 2: 7, 3: 19. As all Bible students know, we are never expressly informed in what this image consisted, and to assume that it was in the point of "spirit," or, what is no less common in that of immortality, is to do what the whole volume palpably condemns. Man is of "dust," and was at the very first merely a candidate for an eternity of being, as may be easily discovered by an unprejudiced examination of the arrangements in Eden, and the trial to which our first parents were subjected there. The language "image of God," in which man as man is still found (James 3: 9, 1 Cor. 11: 7), seems to have a primary special reference to the dominion which was to be exercised by him over the inferior tribes, like that which the Everlasting maintains in the boundless universe, for so soon as it is said, "let us make man in our image," it is added "and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air," &c. Gen. 1: 26.

But whatever it may consist in, or however numerous may be its elements, it is demonstrable that it describes man not as a spirit, for he only *has* a spirit, being himself of the dust entirely; moreover it cannot lawfully be understood to intimate that he is immortal, since he has never been any thing else, in all the dispensations under which he has been placed, than a candidate for eternal life. One simple statement of what man is, and the position he occupies in the universe, is worth a thousand *inferences* drawn from the words "image of God," or a thousand conjectures as to what their meaning may be. Such direct intimations are abundant in the Volume, and they are to teach us in interpreting "image of God," what its import *cannot* be: patience and application may enable us to acquire a satisfactory apprehension of its signification.

6. Matter is base, and gross—man must be more than that. Man, we beg leave to answer, is just what his Maker composed him of, and that is, "the *dust* of the *ground*," "He knows our frame, he remembers we are *dust*." This mode of characterizing our divine Parent's material production, seems to be neither wise nor reverential. Our vanity may lead us to entertain foolish ideas about forms and substances, to establish vast differences between material beings and spiritual beings,—the latter more correctly to be described as matterless nonentities,—but we ought rather to act in a sensible manner, and consult for his glory in our con-

ceptions and language. Gross matter! where find we such expressions in the Bible? "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof." Men speak of matter as if it was execrated by the Supreme,—as if it was a Satanic production, thrust, against his consent, into the empty kingdom of immensity,—as if it was charged with all sinful and loathsome attributes and influences. Through some most contorted philosophising, notions like these have been common in oriental countries, especially in India, from time immemorial; and many a heart-sick child of man, is at this moment toiling there in penance, enduring terrific self-maceration, and located, in dreary contemplations, under some verdant shade, perhaps beneath the scorching sun itself, endeavoring to modify the material conditions in which they find themselves, and vainly hoping in virtue of their deeds and sufferings, to pass eventually into the tomb of unconsciousness, the infinite depths of Brama's nature, by whom it is the quintessence of all privileges to be totally and eternally absorbed, as a bottle of water, when broken, mixes with and is lost in the ocean whence it had originally been drawn. The Indian devotees and fanatics are the genuine haters of matter, because they have been taught it is the fountain of all uncleanness; and man—whom they most orthodoxically hold to be pure spirit—is regarded by them as defiled in consequence of his wretched marriage with it in the form of fleshly organization. From these wonderful climes the dogmas about souls and spirits, and the detestation of innocent tangible substance, have flowed over the western regions of the globe, both in ancient and modern periods. We trace the eastern conceit, concerning the sinfulness of matter, denying the "flesh of our Lord;" hence the anxiety of John to demonstrate that he "came by water and by blood"—that he was no shadowy being, as the Docetae asserted, but an actual brother in the common organized humanity; we see it pervading the Romish Church, originating the institution of priestly celibacy, and leading deluded multitudes to ignoble self-torturings and deprivations; amongst ourselves we also find it, in a reduced form no doubt, yet really pervading the whole of society, for the mention of materialism excites horror in the most of minds. Let us cease to misrepresent and malign our Father's works; let us begin to acknowledge that, as far as man is concerned, the Scripture is the grand patron of materialism, for each member of our race is of "dust," and his "spirit," which has been so inordinately magnified, almost into divine qualities and proportions, is but a very humble, yet unspeakably useful, element—the ordinary electrified air of heaven.

We are what the Almighty has made us. To persist in cavilling at what lies at the foundation of our being is folly and impiety. Matter it is; but matter mysteriously, and often sublimely, endowed. The *Quarterly Review* lately asserted that "Chemically speaking a man is forty-five pounds of carbon and nitrogen diffused through five and a half pailsful of water;" common-place elements no doubt, yet how combined, vivified, enriched with diverse and inexplicable forces with which we are well acquainted;—forces of voluntary and spontaneous movements, forces of thought and will, passion and desire. Chemically, man may be so much carbon, nitrogen, and water; but so much carbon, nitrogen, and water, is not a man, and there is the immense difference. The Venus de Medicis, the statue that "enchants the world," is only a quantity of common white marble; yet it is marble touched and shaped by the chisel of genius, and he would be esteemed an imbecile who, while gazing on that creation, should exclaim, "is this the marvel of art, just so many pounds of ordinary marble?" The "Last Judgment" of Michael Angelo is, in one view, so much canvas, and so much paint, the value of which, in themselves, is very trifling; but then, O reader, observe, so much cloth, and so much color, would never form that awful painting; and he would pass in society as bordering on idiotcy who would, when ushered into the presence of that great work, utter in derision, "what a noise to make about so many square feet of canvas, and so many ounces of oil and coloring substances?" It is not the materials, friend, one might whisper to him; it is what the mighty genius of Angelo, the Milton of painters, has accomplished with them; they are cheap and vulgar in themselves; they have been dignified beyond expression, however, by his magic pencil. Look out on a gorgeous sunset, and, as you contemplate the spectacle, think that it is merely so much vapor, penetrated by the rays of the declining orb; and what reduction from the magnificence and the pleasure does that lowly fact create in a sensitive mind? What cares he,—what, we may aver cares any one, about the elements at the foundation of the excelling vision? It is all, chemically speaking, easily understood and expressed; the effect, nevertheless, of the union, and position, and changes of the elements is divine indeed, and each eye, not utterly imbruted, kindles as it views the drapery, and the isles, and the halls, and the climes of beauty, delineated on the evening sky. There we see the Infinite Artist producing his visions of thrilling grandeur, and he may employ what elements he pleases. And now let us ascend to a higher field in creation, where we encounter the phenomena of life and mind. A man looks through a microscope, and sees the millions of animals sporting in a drop of water; he beholds in that singular world thought, and will, and desire, and love, and anger, on a reduced scale, and what though each creature itself is substantially nothing more than an atom of carbon, and an atom of water? True; it really may be no more; still it is this minute portion of matter endowed with such wonderful properties, that a resemblance is discoverable between the animalculi and the grandest mentalization in the universe. Orthodoxy sees in the case of these diminutive beings, no immaterial and perpetual spirit urging on the vile organization; at bottom these denizens of the drop of water are of vulgar elements, yet the elements are ennobled by life and undeniable mental functions. Again, consider the dog, the bee, the horse, and the beaver, for the same remarks are applicable to them. What though the creature in each case is of common materials,—carbon, nitrogen, and water,—look at its attributes, such wisdom, skill, discernment, and kindness; and yet few imagine all this demands, as its explanation, the presence of a mysterious, immaterial, and deathless spirit. Matter in their case is wisely deemed, by enlightened physiologists, enough; and to a thinking individual it affords little concern what these beings are constructed from; it is with the various phenomena displayed by them, that his thoughts are attracted and his curiosity

stimulated. Only ignorance, to our view, as pitiful as it is profound, would, on considering the powers and excellences of these inferior tribes, give expression to the complaint or the derisive exclamation, "a few ounces, a few pounds of matter, and is that the whole!" No; it is not all, if he would more narrowly examine the point, for it is matter, by the wonderful energy of Omnipotence, gifted with astonishing capacities, evolving mental manifestations, in many instances of a high and interesting character. Once more, to make a last supposition, let us imagine an archangel subjected to chemical analysis, and that he is found to consist of but very common elements, similar to those detected in the composition of a human being. Shall we despise all he has ever said, and thought, and done, on that account? The lofty conceptions, the profound discoveries, the songs of transcendent excellence he may have composed and uttered, the emotions of love and piety that rose for ages, like a tide from the depths of his heart, shall we despise all these? Shall we underrate the worth of his being, especially the exalted dignity of his character, which stood forth, like a mountain clad in celestial beauties,—because the materials of his constitution are discovered to be cheap and abundant? The sunset is ravishing though but light and water: he is glorious in virtue of what had been evolved from a combination of material elements endowed with forces so overwhelmingly sublime. If matter could do the whole, what more could spirit, even with its fancied virtues and adaptations, be made to produce? we say made to produce, for even it would be a material, a something, in the hands of the Creator, who would require to furnish it with the capacities it was destined to evolve. These remarks proceed on the supposition that there is such a thing as "spirit," after the popular belief, and an attenuated affair it is; whereas the Scriptures most clearly understand by created spirit, nothing more at best than refined matter; the one element, or the material atoms, pervading immensity, moulded into the various objects, inanimate and living, appearing on its plains. Man is matter, we are of the dust, and that such unpromising elements, as they appear to our eye, can be so combined, and quickened, and strung, and endowed, as to generate all we feel, and see, and know, from consciousness and observation, betokens His might, and skill, and love, who is "wonderful in counsel and excellent in working."

(*To be Continued.*)

THE JUDGMENT.

BY THE EDITOR.

Much has been said and written on this subject; but we fear a large portion has been "words without knowledge," and that no really definite and practical ideas have been the result. The general notion of the judgment is that of a great assize or court, at which the entire race of Adam are to be *assembled* in one vast concourse, and that each individual case is *then* and *there* to be examined, and all the thoughts of his heart, actions of his life, words of his lips, as well as the *motives* which have governed him, are to pass in review, and his case be decided upon the evidence then appearing, after which the sentence is to be pronounced, and the execution to follow.

Against this view there are great and (with present light) insuperable objections. In presenting them, however, we are aware, we shall have to encounter an almost impassable barrier in the minds of many sincere souls who have had the common notion interwoven in all their religious thoughts and instructions.

Far be it from us to approach such time-honored sentiments with rude hands, and far from us be the wish to unsettle any mind in such a cherished idea, unless we can offer them a more scriptural one, and one that shall be more practical in its influence upon their hearts and lives. Believing, however, that it is possible the popular view may be erroneous, if not pernicious, in its influence, we shall proceed to state some objections to it, and then see if the Scriptures do not warrant and require a different view of the subject.

To the correctness of the view generally entertained, we suggest, first, an objection as to *the time* necessary to such a procedure. We are not to rush upon a conclusion blindly: and it is doubtless true that not one in a thousand, ministers or people, ever have exercised their thoughts on *the time* that must be occupied to *conclude* the judgment, if the popular theory be the true one.

The position we are to occupy on this subject, is not that of a *dogmatist*—or positiveness—but of *investigation*, to find, if possible, the truth on a subject of such absorbing interest to every serious and reflecting mind.

THE TIME *necessary to an examination of each individual case, in the formal manner expressed or implied in the common theory, is an insuperable objection to it.*

As to the number of the human family, it is impossible to arrive at any thing like certainty; yet we are not of those who suppose the number has been so great that they could not all stand upon the globe at one time, as some have affirmed. For a basis of calculation, we will suppose that one generation of the world lasts thirty years. This would give 200 generations in 6000 years. We will now take the present number of the inhabitants of the globe (eight or nine hundred millions) as the number to represent each generation; though it will be seen that this most likely gives us too many. Eight hundred millions multiplied by 200, (the number of generations from Adam to the end of 6000 years), will give us *one hundred and sixty thousand millions* (160,000,000,000!) as the sum total of the human family to be judged, provided the judgment is to occur at the close of the 6000 years. Now, let us allot some specific time to the examination and decision of each individual case, on the supposition they are to be judged in succession—that is, one after another.

1. Allow *one second* to each individual, and *six thousand years* must be taken up in the process.

2. Allow *one minute* to each case, and *three hundred and sixty thousand years* are necessary.

3. Give *one hour* to each, and *twenty-one millions six hundred thousand years* are required. (21,600,000 years!)

4. Let *one day* be the time for each case, and near *eight thousand millions of years* will be necessary to complete the judgment. (8,000,000,000 of years!)

We do not affirm such a period will not be occupied in the judgment, but it certainly looks doubt-

ful when the Scriptures seem every where to speak of the speedy *execution* of the sentence of the judgment on the *return* of Christ. There seems only one way to avoid this protraction of the judgment, and that is to suppose that the examination of all, or of large numbers, is proceeding at one and the same time. This indeed is possible, but then it breaks in upon the notion that each individual case is to be examined before all and exposed to all the race of men.

If we reduce the number to be examined and judged to one-half our estimate, as likely we may in truth, and then allow only *one hour* to each case, at least *ten millions of years* would be necessary to complete the judgment, and before sentence could be executed; or a period about *sixteen hundred times* as long as it has been since Adam was created.

Notwithstanding this seemingly insurmountable difficulty to the common theory, if the Scripture positively affirmed such to be the process of judgment, we would bow to its testimony; but we may find it does not, and we are therefore at liberty to search to see if some other view of the judgment is not the true one.

In addition to the foregoing objection, we urge another on the attention of those who believe the righteous will have a *priority, in time*, in the resurrection, whether that time be one hour, one day, one year, or a thousand years.

How is it to be known who are to have *part* in this favored class, if all in their graves have not been judged *before* the resurrection *begins*? Are the righteous to be raised, and then the process of judgment to be instituted, to see whether the Searcher of hearts has made a mistake? Or, are they to be tried, undergo an examination after their resurrection, as if *suspected* characters? Can we adopt either of these positions? If not, must it not be manifest that they had been judged *before* being raised? And why are they raised, and not the wicked at the same instant, except the wicked also have been judged, and found not worthy to have part in this prior, or "first resurrection?" If these things are so, then we are brought to the inevitable conclusion that the judgment, in which *character and doom* is decided, is at some period *prior* to the resurrection. This, let it be remembered, is not saying there is not a judgment—yea, "*a great day of judgment*,"—at, or immediately upon, the resurrection; but the *nature* of that judgment will be a subject of inquiry as we proceed.

Before going farther, we will endeavor to find out the meaning of the terms judge and judgment. They are variously applied in the Scriptures.

Judgment, in its most simple form, signifies the act of judging, or, the process of examining facts and arguments, to ascertain truth, propriety and justice. It also signifies the determination of the mind, or the conclusion the mind has arrived at from an examination of things presented to its consideration. It is sometimes put for the spirit of wisdom with which a person is endowed. Sometimes it signifies the statutes, or laws and testimony of God. This is often the case, as in Psa. 119. It is applied to remarkable calamities inflicted upon communities and nations. Also, to judicial decisions, and to the *execution* of the sentence following trial and conviction, or acquittal.

These are the general ideas contained in the terms judge and judgment. There are judicial judgments on individuals, communities and nations. The Lord told Abraham He would "*judge* that nation," who were to "afflict" his seed "four hundred years." The process of judgment is definitely recorded in Exodus. Not a personal appearance of Jehovah to the persons judged; but he tested them,—that is, the *rulers* of Egypt, by his servant Moses, and gave them sufficient evidence to have led them to regard his demand, to "let Israel go," if they had not persisted, through their covetousness, to hold those whom they had enslaved. The demands of Moses, and the evidence he exhibited, in the name of the God of the Hebrews, was the judgment process that was to decide the doom of Egypt, or her Princes. Then follows the *executive* judgment, or the judgment carried into execution; and the Lord said, as the *deciding* judgment was drawing to a close, "I will pass through the land of Egypt this night, and smite all the first-born in the land of Egypt....and against all the gods [princes] of Egypt I will *execute* judgment." The *executive* judgment *commenced* that night, and terminated, or was *completed*, at the Red Sea, when Pharoah and all his princes were destroyed. This was judging a nation, or rather her *body of rulers*. The principle, we apprehend, is here brought out, that the judgment is constituted or made up of two parts, viz.: the *investigating* judgment, and the *executive* judgment. The one precedes the other. The first goes on while in a *state of trial*, and when the trial closes, and the evidence or testimony is all elicited, the sentence is passed; the executive judgment follows after at some fixed period. We might illustrate this view with several other examples from Scripture, but we judge this is sufficient for the present.

(*To be continued.*)

—o—

The christian belief in the second century, concerning the state of the dead, is thus set forth by Dr. Gieseler:—"Till then (viz., the "first resurrection") the souls of the departed were to be kept in the under-world (*hades*), and the opinion that they should be taken up into heaven, immediately after death, was considered a Gnostic heresy."—*Eccles. Hist.*, vol. I, p. 167.

—o—

A Beautiful Sentiment.—The late eminent Judge, Sir Allan Parke, once said at a public meeting in London:

"We live in the midst of blessings, till we are utterly insensible of their greatness, and of the source from whence they flow. We speak of our civilization, our freedom, our laws, and forget, entirely, how large a share is due to Christianity. Blot Christianity out of man's history, and what would his laws have been? what his civilization? Christianity is mixed up with our very being, and our very life; there is not a familiar object around us which does not wear a different aspect, because the light of Christian love is upon it—not a law which does not owe its truth and gentleness to Christianity—not a custom which cannot be traced in all its holy, beautiful parts, to the gospel."

—o—

"The Cross of Christ."—The second number by Br. Ham on this interesting subject we have been obliged to lay over till next month.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, JULY, 1853.

"BIBLE CONVENTION."—Such was the name of a Convention called at Hartford, Conn., June 2d, by Andrew Jackson Davis—the great clairvoyant, and leader in spirit manifestations—and others. The call was of some weeks standing in the New York Tribune, and also in other papers. It professed the determination to examine the authenticity of the Bible, &c., and to give the believers in it a full share of time to defend it, if they could. It was manifest that the call was gotten up with the deepest hostility to the Bible; and we cannot help the suspicion that the design was to overthrow its divine authority, and then to establish "spirit rappings," or "spirit manifestations" on its ruins.

We had no idea of attending that Convention, but through the earnest solicitation of Br. Miles Grant, of Winsted, Conn., we at last consented to go, two days before the time appointed for the meeting. We did not arrive till after the morning session of the first day. Most of the first day was occupied by the opposers of the Bible; though Br. Joseph Turner, of Hartford, and myself occupied a part of the time. Near the close of the first day a resolution was adopted giving the stand alternately, for forty minutes, to the speakers on the different sides of the question. This seemed fair, but as the sequel will show was not adhered to by the Anti-Bible party. Still we were not disposed to complain, only we wished the fact to be known.

A long string of charges was brought against the Bible, by the Chairman, Joseph Barker, of Ohio, recently from England, and formerly a Methodist preacher—in which he attempted to make out that the Bible sanctioned all manner of crimes, &c. He was followed by Henry C. Wright, formerly a Congregational minister; once a Non-Resistant and Peace man, but now an opposer of the Bible. He opened with the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Bible, in some parts of the Old and New Testaments, sanctions injustice, concubinage, prostitution, oppression, war, plunder, and wholesale murder; and, therefore, the doctrine of the Bible, *as a whole*, is false, and injurious to the social and spiritual growth and perfection of man."

This resolution opened the battle in earnest. We took the stand and remarked, that when any person was accused of crime the *law* by which he was to be tried should be distinctly stated and known; else how is it to be known whether he is guilty or not. We demanded, therefore, *the law* by which the Bible was to be tried. This inquiry was approved by Mr. Wright, and he undertook to define the law, which seemed to be very indefinite, as it was the sense of right every man had in himself. As the definition was unsatisfactory, he was pressed for something more definite. After much time had been spent in this inquiry, we asked Mr. Wright, if we were to understand him that the law under which the Bible was to be tried, on his charges, was "Natural Religion, the Theology of Nature, or the *God of* Nature?" To this he answered distinctly —"*Yes.*" We thanked him that he had at last given a *definite* law, and here we joined issue with him, and those on his side of the question. We showed that, tried by this law he could not *condemn* the Bible, even if it sanctioned all he had charged upon it: for the God of Nature swept away, by "wholesale murder," whole cities by earthquakes, laying them desolate in a moment: by floods he overwhelmed various parts of the land, "*robbing*" the laborers of their hard toil: by pestilence, cholera, &c., he inflicts the most terrible sufferings and distress: that the God of Nature, for aught can be made to appear without the Bible, "sanctions injustice, concubinage, and prostitution," inasmuch as these practices prevail where the influence of the Bible is not known. We affirmed, therefore, that the Bible, or the God of the Bible, tried by the law as defined by the opposers of it must be *acquitted*. Mr. Wright made a faint effort to clear his God of Nature from the charge of "wholesale murder;" and said, he "denied that the God of Nature ever did send an earthquake to kill anybody—earthquakes were natural omens; and if men had not got in the way of it they would not have been killed," &c.

We replied to him, that his "natural omens" were the natural *actions* of his God of Nature! and when this God of Nature knew that his "natural omen" would pass along that way he gave the innocent inhabitants of the city, who had never sinned against him, no notice of his intention, but came upon them suddenly and overwhelmed them in ruin. Whereas, the God of the Bible, when about to destroy the wicked inhabitants of Canaan, who had planted themselves on a land which the Most High had given to the children of Israel when he divided the earth among the inhabitants, gave them "*forty years*" notice of his determination to put Israel into the land he had given them; and confirmed the truth of his purpose in the matter by the astonishing works he performed for Israel in Egypt and in the wilderness: so that the God of the Bible was *better* than his God of Nature, and could not be condemned by the law specified.

Mr. Wright said, "the God of the Bible commanded Abraham to *butcher* his son;" and added—"I have been asked if I would do such a deed if

God commanded it? *No!* I would *cut the throat of such a God.*" Mr. Wright uttered this with terrible emphasis.

We replied, that when our friend Wright was a follower of Jesus he was a *peace* man, but now he seems changed into a *war* man: that then he was a *non-resistence* man—would not use violence if a man was to injure his family in any way; but now he is for blood: yes, if only *commanded*—not compelled—to kill his child he would "*cut the throat* of such a God!" We denied that God commanded Abraham to "*butcher* his son;" and when Abraham put forth his hand to take the knife God commanded him not to do it. We affirmed that Mr. Wright's God of Nature had not only commanded, but *compelled* tender mothers to *kill* and *eat* their children, as in cases of siege and famine in cities. We called upon friend Wright to cut the throat of his God, for he was a far worse God than the God of the Bible, even if the former were as bad as he had charged. Besides, his God of Nature gives no revelation of reasons for his murderous conduct; while the God of the Bible does inform us of another life and the reasons of the evils of this.

Mr. Wright maintained that the God of Nature took men to a better state or condition when they die. He had however only one proof to offer on this point, *viz:* "The caterpillar turns to a butterfly:" *ergo*, a man at death is transformed in like manner.

This wonderful illustration we have heard urged so many times, in seeming triumph, that we thought best to show its fallacy, and remarked that in the case of the caterpillar *life* never was *extinct:* penetrate his habitation and extingush life and see if a butterfly ever appears: *never.* And the butterfly—where is its transformation at death? there it lies upon the earth, and returns to dust. This marvellous illustration of what the God of Nature does with man at death is evaporated, and proves nothing of his hereafter. No, the God of Nature gives not one ray of light on that period beyond this life.

Mr. Wright had spoken in the most unmerciful manner of the Levitical priesthood and its institutions, calling them "*a contemptible foolery*;" and then proceeded to make some criticisms on the teaching of Jesus. To show how faulty Jesus was, he quoted Mat. 5: 27, 28—"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." That is, said Mr. Wright, "If a man *desires* a woman for *a wife* he has committed adultery according to Jesus!"

We must say we were shocked at such a glaring perversion of words; and at such an attempt to pour contempt on Jesus the Life Giver. In reply we first read an extract from Lord Bolingbroke, which Dr. McCulloh has quoted in his "Proofs of Credibility of Scripture Writers," vol. 1, page 240. Dr. McCulloh says:—

"*Lord Bolingbroke*, however inimical to the theory of the divine constitution of Christianity, has not hesitated to render the clearest testimony to its excellent morality, as the following extracts from his writings abundantly show. And his observation on the subject of theological teaching, not only is creditable to his discernment, but does justice to the actual merits of Christianity, which most other deists have endeavored to confound with false teachings of men."

The following are the extracts Dr. McCulloh gives from Bolingbroke, and which we read in our reply to Mr. Wright.

"The gospel teaches universal benevolence, recommends the precepts of it, and commands the observation of them in particular instances occasionally, always supposes them, always enforces them, and makes the law of right reason a law in every possible definition of the word beyond all cavil. *I say beyond all cavil*, because a great deal of *silly cavil* has been employed to perplex the plainest thing in nature, and the best determined signification of words according to the different occasions on which they are used."—*Bolingbroke, Essay* 4, *section* 5.

"The gospel of Christ is one continued lesson of the strictest morality, of justice, of benevolence, and of universal charity."—*Bolingbroke, Fragments of Essays*, 20.

We then proceeded to remark, that Mr. Wright had called the "Jewish Priesthood a contemptible foolery," but we would not call his criticism on our Lord's words a "*contemptible*" criticism, yet we would in the language of Lord Bolingbroke, call it a "*silly cavil.*" It was an unwarrantable construction of the words; an attempt to make it appear that Jesus was opposed to honorable marriage. We called attention to Math. 19: 4—6, "The Pharisees" asked him, "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And Jesus answering, said unto them, Have ye not read that He which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said for this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore, they are no more one twain but one flesh. What therefore *God hath joined together let not man put asunder.*" How does my friend Wright's *cavil* look in the light of this announcement? Truly it is a "*silly cavil.*"

Other speakers against the Bible were answered by Br. Turner; and answered well. We must say

that he did nobly for the truth. If the speeches are reported and published, as the leaders in the Convention said they should be, we shall publish more fully on the subject at another time.

After the second day there was a strong desire manifested to prevent "two men"—as they called Br. Turner and ourself—occupying *half* the time of the Convention, and a move was made to alter the rule, which however failed, the more intelligent of their own party opposing it. Nevertheless in several instances injustice was done us by putting down as on our side of the question some spirit rappers, and even one insane man, because they professed to believe some things in the Bible inspired, while they manifestly had no confidence in it now. By this means the leaders managed to occupy just about two-thirds of the time. At this point we take pleasure in saying, that Andrew Jackson Davis did not approve of that course; and however mistaken we regard him in his theory, he acted a gentlemanly part throughout; and it is gratifying to our feelings to give him this credit.

The spirit rapping manifestations were not reached before the Convention closed, at the end of the fourth day. So much of the design of that meeting was defeated, if we are right in our view of its design.

Mr. Barker would be best replied to by republishing in this country his work, published in England 1841, entitled "*Christianity Triumphant;*" a masterly work, which we deeply regretted we did not have with us at the Convention. Had we anticipated meeting him there, we would have had it with us. We will at a future time furnish our readers with some extracts from it, by which they will see that Joseph Barker the *Christian* is more than a match for Joseph Barker the *Deist.*

Mr. Barker said, in the Convention, that our remarks on the God of Nature would lead to Atheism. We were well aware that we crowded him and his fellow-laborers up to Atheism; that is the ultimate and legitimate end of their position—they must go there or return to the God of the Bible, there is no avoiding it. No man can prove whether there be one God or many by natural theology; nor whether the attributes of goodness, truth, or justice exist in such God or Gods. Hence when these men are shown that *their* God or Gods of Nature manifest evil of the worst kind and give them no clear knowledge of any better state hereafter, no wonder they talk about going into Atheism! that is their true position.

We are truly sorry for our friend Barker's position. We cannot imagine what outrage some *professed* Christians have inflicted upon him which has so embittered him against Christianity. We respect him even in his apostacy from Christianity, but we have no sympathy for his "*silly cavils*" on the Scriptures. His "*cavils*" on our Lord's sermon on the mount, in the late Convention, we should suppose would have satisfied any sane mind that his delight is to find fault with Jesus. O, that he may yet return to him who alone can give him rest.

We are glad we attended that Convention. We loved the Bible before, but our love and attachment to it has been increased a hundred fold. Never did it appear so precious to us as now. Never did we see the weakness of Deism as now: yet the time has come that men having departed from the faith will give heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons, speaking lies in hypocrisy, and having their consciences seared as with a hot iron; and are given up to believe a lie that they may be condemned to death, because they have rejected the truth. We desire, however, to save as many from such a doom as possible; therefore we are glad that God enabled us to withstand publicly this flood of deism and atheism that is now flowing like a deluge over the earth to prepare men for the terrible harvest which is just at hand.

With whatever ability Br. Turner and ourself were enabled to manage our defence of the Bible, to the God of that blessed book be all the glory and praise. It is indeed a comfort to know that the effort to defend the truth of God and his Bible was not in vain. We are satisfied that whatever may be the boasts of those who were against the Bible, they were sadly disappointed in their effort at Hartford. Not one of their "Resolutions" were passed, nor did they care to hazard a vote on them. We would have been glad to have had one. There is no doubt they would have been voted down by an overwhelming majority.

P. S.—Since the foregoing was written an article appeared in the New York Tribune, of June 14, from Joseph Barker, on reading which we addressed the following note to Horace Greeley, editor of that paper:—

DISCUSSION ON THE BIBLE—THE OTHER SIDE.

To the Editor of the N. Y. Tribune:

NEW YORK, Tuesday, June 14, 1853.

SIR: I see in your paper of to-day, "Joseph Barker," Chairman of the late Hartford Convention says, that "Convention *exceeded* the expectations of its authors, except in one particular, namely, the weakness of the opposition they met with. They certainly expected to hear from believers in the divine authority of the Bible an abler defense of their views."

Santa Anna was sure he had "whipped General Taylor, only the old man did not know it!" Just about as appropriate is this boasting of Joseph

Barker. If they ever dare to publish that discussion *in full*, the public can judge. In the mean time, will you do the justice to publish the following remarks from *The Hartford Courant*, the morning after the Convention closed:

"We must do justice to Messrs Storrs, of New York, and Turner, of this place, who manfully battled for the truth and authority of the Bible. Their arguments were unanswered and unanswerable."

If it is not asking too much, will you also give the following extract from *The Hartford Daily Times* of Thursday last. Speaking of one of the defenders of the Bible in that Convention, the editor says:

"Upon this somewhat novel arena, it is but justice to say that he acquitted himself with an ability which could scarcely have been equalled—certainly not surpassed—by any clerical man in the State. The ordinary clergy of the city no doubt felt it to be both a laborious and unpleasant duty to defend the Bible in a crowded and mixed assemblage. * * * Mr. S. chose to face the repulsive task which his brethren shrank from, and it is due to him to say, that he performed it in a manner which would have raised the highest reputation among them higher."

I ask the insertion as an act of justice, after Mr. Barker's *self* commendation of himself and associates; whom many believe were *entirely* routed in argument, at the aforesaid Convention.

ONE WHO WAS THERE."

To the foregoing note we appended the following:—

"*Private.*—If you wish a responsible name, I subscribe myself

GEORGE STORRS, *Editor Bible Examiner*,
140 Fulton-st."

To our note the editor of the Tribune appended the following:—

"If the writer of the above had had the manliness to sign his "self-commendation of himself" with his own name as Mr. Barker did, he would have been as deserving of respect. As it is, we are sorry to say that under the circumstance, his anonymous signature is rather mean and sneaking."

Our only object in the note to the Tribune was to show, that while Mr. Barker, a *party* in the discussion, had come to a conclusion favorable to himself and associates, and against the *defenders* of the Bible, the public in Hartford took another view of the subject. Had "self-commendation" been our object we would not have given an *extract* from the Hartford Times, suppressing the most *commendatory* part of the article and our name in full, more than once found in it.

Has our note to the Tribune *unmasked* its Editor, and shown that *his sympathies are with the Deists and against the Bible*? Let the community know where the conductors of public journals stand. The Tribune in a previous article, from its correspondent, or reporter at the Convention, did Br. Turner great injustice, by its sneers at one of his speeches. We repeat it. Br. Turner did himself and the cause he defended honor, the sneers of the Tribune to the contrary notwithstanding. The sense of the community at Hartford on the subject of the defence of the Bible in that Convention may be seen in the following resolution, passed among others, at a large meeting of the citizens, held the evening after the Convention adjourned, at which Leonard B. Griffin, a Methodist minister, presided.

"*Resolved*, That the sincere and hearty thanks of Christendom are due to the Rev. Messrs. Storrs, of New York, and Turner of this city, for their able, manly, fearless, laborious and triumphant defence of the Holy Scriptures, during the recent Convention."

With such testimony in favor of our services at the Convention, we can bear to have the editor of the Tribune call us "*mean and sneaking*," and show his sympathy with the *self-praising* "Joseph Barker," Chairman, and principal deistical speaker at the Convention. Mr. Barker, we respect as a man, and for his defence of Christianity years ago; but we deeply deplore his fall, and most sincerely pity him in his present position.

———o———

AUTHENTICITY OF THE SCRIPTURES.—All the attempts of Deists to overthrow the Scriptures avail nothing unless they can impeach the integrity of the Witnesses. It is no argument against the Bible to say we do not know by *whom*, or *when* the books were written. It must be shown that whoever wrote them were *impostors* or *knaves*.

Impostors and knaves have always SELFISH ends in view. Deists say that the Scriptures are a *forgery* of *designing Priests*.

A careful examination of the Mosaic institutions will show that such an imputation is false, so far as that institution is concerned.

The same may be said of the institutions of Christianity On these points we earnestly recommend, to all, a careful reading of Dr. M'Culloh's work, noticed in the last Examiner. It sweeps away the whole refuge of Deistical lies, that the Scripture institutions and teachings by Moses and Jesus Christ are a forgery, and shows conclusively that they were divine in their origin.

———o———

"PLENARY."—This word is often used in speaking of the inspiration of the Bible; and many persons seem not to understand it. It means—*full; entire; complete.* In the mouths of objectors to the Bible, it seems to be used to make people believe that the defenders of the Bible hold that *every word* found in that book was given by immediate inspiration of God. We cannot say but there are those who do hold that view; but we

doubt if any intelligent Christian in this age maintains any such position.

The great question between us and the rejectors of the Bible is,—*Are the doctrines and institutions by Moses and Jesus Christ, of* DIVINE *appointment, and given by direct inspiration?*

It is not, even, whether *every word* used in the record of those institutions and doctrines was immediately inspired. On this point we can safely admit they were not; but we contend that a true record of the *mind of God* is made, though each writer might do it in his own words. The truthfulness of any transaction or event does not depend upon the uniformity of the words used by different witnesses, but in their agreement in *the facts* relating to the point in hand. Such agreement exists on the inspiration, or divine appointment of the doctrines and institutions by Moses and Jesus Christ; and all the "*silly cavil*" of Deists only serves to make this truth more apparent to honest inquirers after truth.

———o———

SPIRIT RAPPING.—We cut the following from a Spirit Rapping paper in this city:

"ROBERT OWEN AND SPIRITUALISM.—Robert Owen is universally known as the author, and, for many years, the zealous propagator of a theory of Social Reform. Whatever of unphilosophical extravagance may have been incorporated with his views, it must be acknowledged that the productions of his pen have, in general, manifested a degree of practical common sense, and a power of observation and deduction, not likely to be imposed upon by any shallow system of fraud or delusive trickery. Until lately, Mr. Owen was a confirmed disbeliever in the *immortality of the soul;* but, like hundreds of others of the skeptical class, he has experienced an entire revolution in his views, in consequence of witnessing unmistakable manifestations of power and intelligence from the Spirits of the departed."

Spirit-Rappers seem to suppose, if they can convert a man to a belief of the natural "*immortality of the soul*," they have demonstrated the utility and truthfulness of their theory; but we come to precisely the opposite conclusion. The doctrine of the natural or inherent immortality of the soul we regard as *the greatest and most mischievous of lies!* There is not one solitary text in the Bible to support such a doctrine, except Gen. 3: 4, "Ye shall not surely die." Not another can be found. He who caused those words to be uttered, Jesus saith, is a "*liar*, and the *father of lies*." The conversion of Robert Owen, therefore, is only a fulfillment of Scripture, that "Seducers shall wax worse and worse, *deceiving and being deceived*." 2 Tim. 3: 13. We have so often heard the advocates of these Spirit rappings boast that men have been converted by their means from infidelity, that we cannot forbear to say, that, in our opinion, they only go *a step deeper* in infidelity; yea, that they sink into a *hopeless state of it*. They seem to us to be given over, because of their disbelief of Bible truth, "to believe a lie," that they may be condemned to death, "the wages of sin." So far as our experience has been concerned, we have uniformly found such converts as Robert Owen greater despisers of the Bible than before, and exceedingly offended when we have used that book against them, manifesting the deepest hatred to it.

When we find a person who is a believer in the Bible converted to Spirit Rapping, we know that, unless he is soon arrested, he will in a short time renounce the Bible. We have seen this in many cases; and it was fully manifested at the late Convention at Hartford, Connecticut, some account of which we give this month. That Spirit Rappings and the Bible have any harmony between them is not true; they are as opposite to each other as *lying* and *truth*.

———o———

BIBLE VS. TRADITION.—This work has now been several weeks before the public; many have read it, and, with one solitary exception, so far as we know, it has met with universal commendation, and is regarded as *the very best work* that has appeared on the immortality question. Br. Marsh, of the Advent Harbinger, pronounces it a "*valuable work*," and expresses the desire "that the community in general may be induced to read it." Br. Turner, of the Second Advent Watchman, thus speaks of it:

"This is a new and deeply interesting work of 309 octavo pages, printed well on good paper, and neatly bound in cloth. It is all it professes to be; indeed, its value to the lover of the Bible can in no sense be appreciated except by knowing its contents and by studying the Bible by the light it reflects upon what are, to many minds, perplexing questions of theology. It will assist all who read it, to arrive at a correct knowledge of the penalty of the law of God—the state of the dead, and the true hope and source of immortality. Every family should possess this book, no other *help* can supply its place."

Many private individuals have spoken to us, or written to us, expressing similar sentiments. Br. Richmond, who is on a mission in the State of Indiana, under the Provisionary Committee, says of it, "It is a flood of light. I know not how I could dispense with it." See his letter.

Those who cannot preach, can buy at least one copy, and *lend* it through their neighborhood. It will preach most effectually.

Price 75 cents: for *one dollar*, sent us free of

postage, we will send one copy of it, and the two double Examiners, containing Ham's works, and *prepay* the postage on them all. We make this liberal offer now, that each of those works may be speedily and more widely circulated.

For $5 we will send *ten* copies of Bible vs. Tradition, but it must be at the expense of the purchaser.

———o———

"SPIRIT: *or the Hebrew Terms 'Ruach' and 'Neshamah,' and the Greek Term 'Pneuma.'* By Wm. Glen Moncrieff." Edinburgh, Scotland.

We have received a copy of this work from the author, for which he will accept our thanks. It contains about 100 pages, 12mo., and is a valuable work on the subject of which it treats. The ground occupied is the same as that in Bible vs. Tradition. We may notice it more fully hereafter. The "Appendix" contains several valuable articles on "*Materialism*," which we shall give in the Examiner; we have made a commencement in this number. This work entire, or his work on "*Soul*," which we have previously noticed, we cannot reprint at present. We hope they may be widely circulated in England and Scotland, having no doubt they will do much good.

———o———

J. PANTON HAM.—The Christian Examiner is received regularly, and much prized; but the Hymn Book has never come to hand. We regret this much, as we have intended to enlarge, and improve our "Christian Psalmody," and hoped to find aid from yours.

———o———

"EVANGELICAL SOCIETY."—This Society was "Organized at Rochester, N. Y., June 4th, 1853," and has issued, in a pamphlet of ten pages, its "Address, Preamble, Constitution, and Bye-Laws." It has divided up the Northern, a small portion of the Southern States, and Canada, into twelve "Branches of this Society;" and contemplates going into the work of *evangelizing* all in its power to the *whole* truth of the Bible. It disclaims being a "Church Organization," and prohibits any "attempt to construct a Church creed." Any person may become a member by paying *one dollar* per year, and signing the Constitution and Bye-Laws.

We hold to the utmost liberty of action, in the work of spreading what any may think is truth, as taught in the Bible. This Society has been called into existence, according to the "Address of the Committee," by "oft repeated and urgent calls, from almost every quarter—'*come over and help us!*'" We wish it success in helping to supply those calls. Their work, professionally, embraces the promulgation of the *whole* truth; but there are not a few who think some things may be embraced in their term "*whole*," which they could not contribute to spread abroad. If we were called upon to act with them we would far rather they should *specify* what they consider the *whole* truth. But as there is no probability of a *perfect* harmony in that respect, our opinion is unaltered as to its being the better way to act in reference to some point or points of neglected truth, leaving those who preach on these points at entire liberty to preach according to their own convictions on other topics. When the "*Provisionary Committee*," in this city, announced their object, they stated, distinctly, it was "to scatter light on the *Life theme*;" but that it had "no desire to restrict the laborers on other topics." So far as they felt called to preach on other topics, it was on their *personal* responsibility. We have no fault to find with our brethren, who may think that our object is too limited; let them act according to their own convictions in the case. The *Provisionary Committee* will go on with their proposed plan as before, without feeling themselves at all interfered with by the "*division of the land*" into "*twelve*" sections, or tribes. By the new Society, a medium is open for those to contribute funds who might have felt that the object of the Provisionary Committee was too limited. Such will now have no excuse for withholding funds. Others, doubtless, will prefer to contribute to *the one object* we have in view, to scatter light on the long-neglected and forgotten truth, that "*Life and Immortality are through Jesus Christ alone!*" Let all act as their judgment and preference shall prompt them.

NEW-YORK, June 20th, 1853.

HENRY A. CHITTENDEN,
HENRY F. JOHNSON,
GEO. STORRS,
} *Provisionary Committee.*

P. S. For the foregoing considerations, I must decline acting as one of the "Vice-Presidents" of the "Evangelical Society," as per appointment.

H. A. CHITTENDEN.

———o———

THE PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE acknowledge the receipt of the following sums into the *treasury*, since the issue of the June Examiner, *viz.*:

From Friends in Peru, Indiana, by C. M. Richmond	-	$30.00
" a Friend in Newton Hamilton, Pa.		5.00
" " " Williamsburg, N.Y.	-	1.00
" " " Worcester, Mass.	-	10.00

THE PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE have the pleasure of laying before the readers of the Examiner the following interesting letter from Br. C. M. RICHMOND, laboring in the State of Indiana.

PERU, INDIANA, June 6th, 1853.

Dear Brother Storrs:—I arrived in Peru, May 7th, from which date I shall regard myself as laboring under the sanction and direction of the Provisionary Committee. I have preached eleven times in the following villages:—Peru, Mexico, Chili, and Wabash Town. Congregations generally large and attentive. In this town are a few good brethren, who have been excluded or suspended from the several churches for presuming to interpret God's word according to their own judgments, and contrary to the traditions and creeds of men. One of these, Br. Bosworth, is now in great affliction. He has had two shocks of the palsy. I found him rejoicing in hope. Said I, "Br. B. do you look forward to the resurrection with hope and joy?" "That is everything," said he, his countenance beaming with delight, and with a faltering tongue, but an unfaltering hope he repeated the following:—

"My flesh shall rest beneath the ground
Till the last trumpet's voice shall sound,
Then burst my chains with glad surprise,
And meet my Saviour in the skies."

In Chili, on Eel River, the interest seems very encouraging. The School House being too small to hold the people, we met in a grove near by. At night a Reformer, *alias* Campbellite, volunteered his services in behalf of endless torment, &c., which served to increase the excitement and deepen the inquiry—"*are these things so?*" On Monday evening I replied to our "orthodox" friend to more than could be accommodated in the School House—they stood at the windows and door. The truth, I think, is taking root in many hearts in Chili. I am to be there again, to follow up the effort next Lord's day. The ministers and leading men of the several churches seem to hear (if at all) with the least candor. In some instances they refuse to accept of any thing to read upon the subject, though they acknowledge they have never investigated the matter! If this is not "*loving darkness rather than light*," what is? I have many requests from various places to come and hold meetings, but I cannot comply with half of them. "The harvest is great and the laborers few." I intend, as soon as I get time, to go down the River and visit Logansport, and perhaps other places on the line of the Canal.

I have sold some publications and given away some, a report of which will in due time, be forthcoming. The people must have time to think, and think again, and again, before they will give up their long cherished religious errors; and until the truth takes root and men become fully convinced of the truth of *Life only in Christ*, we can hardly expect much active effort. But I trust the time is not far distant, when this section of Indiana will be able to support a missionary, without any aid from abroad. But it is not so at present.

In this place the following sums have been subscribed to the fund of Provisionary Committee.

H. H. H.	$20.00
A. R. A.	5.00
D. C. S.	5.00

I am told of two brethren, who are preaching the Life and Death doctrine in Indiana, with whom I am not yet acquainted. Br. David Wright of Independence, and Br. Moses Swallow, of Deerfield, Randolph County. I have written them, and expect to hear from them soon.

I received the commission of Provisionary Committee in good time, as well as the books sent by Br. Hall, all in good order. Br. Hall very generously gave in the freight, so that they came to me free of charge. We received the two copies of "Bible vs. Tradition," with great pleasure. I am thankful to you for your consideration in sending it. It is a flood of light. I know not how I could dispense with it. It seems to me it must turn orthodoxy from its base. Had I a few copies of it I think I could sell them readily.

I am encouraged in my work, for though I am despised and rejected by those who stand as the exponents of *immortality independent of Christ*, yet I find many warm Christian friends who bid me a hearty God speed; and I am encouraged by the parable of the sower, that *some seed* will fall into good ground, spring up, and yield thirty, sixty, and an hundred fold. Your brother,

C. M. RICHMOND.

NOTE BY EDITOR.—We rejoice that Br. Richmond is so much encouraged in his work, and that the prospect for doing good in Central Indiana opens so well. May the Lord abundantly sustain him. Our friends in the East should remember him pecuniarily, as his field is a new one with the exception of Peru, where a good beginning is made to furnish the funds necessary to carry on the work. It is a small compensation the Provisionary Committee have pledged to Br. Richmond; but to raise that we must continue to appeal to the friends of the truth he is laboring to disseminate. He ought to have a larger supply of books, tracts, &c., for gratuitous circulation. Who will help in this matter? *Who?*

THE PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE will make at least quarterly reports of all their *Expenditures*, as well as regular monthly notices of Receipts. No *member* of this Committee receives a cent from its funds for any purpose whatever. If any wish to help "Br. Storrs," they will communicate with him *individually ;* as all money sent to the Provisional Committee will be appropriated to those who have been or may be announced as laborers in the field, by appointment of the Committee. Brs. White and Blain have neither of them yet entered upon their agency. We hope they will be able to do so soon, and that others will be found to do the same. The great *Life Theme* must be published far and wide. The cry still comes up to us for help on this particular subject. Kindred subjects are important in their connection, but this theme lies at the foundation of the whole Gospel fabric ; understand this, and all other subjects come in naturally, and complete the doctrinal, experimental, and practical temple of truth.

———o———

FROM A. N. SEYMOUR, MICHICAN.

Br. Storrs.—The cause of truth in these Western States, I am well satisfied, is destined to move onward in spite of all opposition. The way opens before me, to go and preach the doctrine of "*No Immortality out of Christ.*" One good sign of success is, multitudes throng to hear, and I love to preach these precious truths better than I love to eat ; and if I ever saw the time that I wanted to do a thousand days' work in one it is now ; while I see the extreme foolishness of popular preaching, and its direct tendency to infidelity, I can hardly rest day nor night, and my prayer is,—Lord, send forth more true laborers into the great vineyard, for it is now *smutted* up by *Sectarianism*, and the monstrous dogma of *Immortal-soulism ;* from which, good Lord, deliver the human family.

Yours in the love of the Gospel.

———o———

FROM W. H. JACOBS.

WILLIAMSBURG, N. Y., May 26th, 1853.

Br. Storrs.—"Prove all things, hold fast that which is good," is an injunction of Holy Writ, which receives but very little attention from professing Christians in these days of religious declension and conformity to the world. The traditions of men are adhered to rather than the doctrines of Jesus Christ and his Apostles. The word of God is consequently made of none effect. The commandments of men, instead of the word and testimony, predominate ; iniquity abounds, and the love of many waxes cold.

Being unknown to many of your readers, permit me to make a brief statement with reference to myself. I have been a professor of Christianity about eleven years ; was trained up a Baptist. My sympathies have always been with that sect. I have, during the past year, served the First Baptist Church in this place (of which I have been a member the last nine years,) in the office of Deacon.

By a diligent investigation of God's word, I have been led to reject the doctrine of Eternal Life in misery of the finally impenitent; and to believe that the soul that sinneth it shall die. My eyes have been opened—my mind has been enlightened, and the truth, as it is in Jesus, has made me free.

On the evening of April 19th inst., I was excluded from the Church, on the following charge, *viz. :—Denying the Personality of the Holy Spirit,—the Interminable Misery of the Wicked,* —and the Immortality *of the Soul.*

My humble efforts to lead others to embrace the truth have been blessed, and several are rejoicing with me in hope of the kingdom at the coming of Jesus Christ, which we trust is near at hand. May God, even our Father, bless you, my brother, and enlarge your usefulness ; and cause many through your efforts to seek for immortality.

Yours, in hope of Eternal Life, which God, who cannot lie, promised before the world began.

———o———

BOLD ASSUMPTION.—At a Convention held at Rochester, N. Y., last month, the Harbinger reports Dr. John Thomas, as having said :—

"A man may *believe the truth with all his heart* for twenty years, *and yet not be justified—Baptism is essential to this—this is the law of justification ;* we are immersed into the name of Jesus Christ."

We have italicised that part of the remarks which we denominate a *bold assumption.* The Bible teaches, in no equivocal terms, that "the law of justification" is *faith.* "That he [God] might be just, and the *justifier* of him which *believeth* in Jesus. Where is boasting then ? It is excluded. By what law ? Of works ? *Nay :* but by *the law of faith.*" Rom. 3 : 26, 27. "Seeing it is one God, which shall *justify* the circumcision *by faith*, and uncircumcision *through faith*," v. 30. "Therefore being *justified by faith*, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. 5 : 1. But it is needless to multiply texts of Scripture on this point ; nothing is taught more distinctly than that "the law of justification" is "*faith.*" To affirm that "bap-

tism is the law of justification," and that "a man may believe *the truth with all his heart* for twenty years," or one year, or one hour, "and yet not be justified," we regard as unscriptural and a daring assumption. The question *is not* whether he can *continue* justified unless he is afterwards baptized; that may be true; and it is equally true that he cannot continue justified if he *knowingly* disobeys God in any of his commands: but that "baptism is *essential*," [*i. e.* that without which it is impossible] to "be justified," is neither scriptural or rational; and such an assumption we regard as the very *highest* development of *sectarianism*. We express our opinion of the sentiment distinctly, that none need be in doubt as to our position on that question. If men wish to establish a *bitter and persecuting sect*, the sentiment we have animadverted upon is the very best they can start with. We are determined to have no strife with those who hold and promulgate such sentiments; we have borne our testimony against it, and thus discharged what we believed was a duty.

———o———

JOSEPH BARKER, the Chairman of the late Convention at Hartford, was in 1841 an able defender of the Bible and Christianity in England. We admired his work entitled "*Christianity Triumphant*," which we purchased some years ago. We have only space this month for two short extracts from it, they are as follows:

"I never saw any harm of any kind that ever Christianity produced. I have now for a long time had something to do with Christianity myself, and it has done *me* no harm. I have studied it attentively for many years: I have believed its doctrines; and I have endeavored, in some measure, to obey its precepts; and it has neither made me vicious nor miserable; it has not injured me either in body or in soul. It has done just the contrary. I was once as violent and revengeful as a youth could easily be; a provocation would have thrown me into a fury, and an injury would have been almost sure to be followed with revenge. But that is not the case with me now; the religion of Christ has produced a happy change.

"Nor has Christianity produced any mischievous effects upon any of my kindred or acquaintances. My parents have been believers in the religion of Christ, and have lived under the influence of its principles for more than forty years; but it never made *them either vicious or miserable.* They have been faithful and affectionate to each other; *they have been kind and attentive to their children;* they have been temperate and industrious; they have been true and upright; and according to their ability, they have labored to promote the welfare of their fellow-creatures. My brothers and sisters are most of them religious; they read and study the religion of Christ on purpose that they may obey its teachings; and yet they are not remarkable either for vice or misery. I have relations that are *not* Christians: I have relations that profess not to believe the Gospel, and who live in open violation of its laws: and *they* are both vicious and miserable. As far as my acquaintance with the world goes, things are just the opposite of what our opponents represent them to be. Those who most heartily believe, and most faithfully practice the religion of Christ, I have always found to be the most virtuous and happy; and those who know the least or care the least for the religion of Christ, I have generally found to be the most vicious and miserable. If men are vicious and miserable, it is for *want* of Christianity; and it seems almost a mystery how any man of common understanding can believe it to be otherwise."

* * * * * * * * *

"I have no anxiety as to the fate of the religion of Christ: it will triumph for ever, and every conflict through which it may have to pass, will only add to it new strength and glory. My only anxiety is for you for whom I write. And if you will ponder well the evidence which has been laid before you; if you will silence the uproar of clamorous and rebellious passions; if you will pay respect to the voice of reason, of conscience, and of truth, my soul will be at rest. You will not only perceive the charges which have been brought against Christianity to be unfounded, but you will acknowledge it, and feel it in your souls to be worthy of unbounded and eternal love. For myself, I declare to you, that while I contemplate its spotless and glorious character, and survey the vast and countless blessings which it has bestowed on the children of men, my heart is full, and the unutterable emotions of my soul break forth in tears. It is the image of the eternal God, and the friend and benefactor of mankind. It blesses all ranks,—it blesses them in all ways,—and it makes them abundant in communicating blessings to their fellow men. It makes those who are rich tender-hearted and liberal,—it makes those who are high, condescending and gentle,—it improves the condition of the poor on earth, and it gives them a title to a kingdom in the world to come. It regenerates men's souls, it reforms their lives,—and it improves their lot. It makes them good; it makes them useful; and it makes them happy. It has blessings for every country, for every family, and for every heart. It wages war with all institutions that are founded in error and injustice. It is opposed to every thing that is opposed to the interests of mankind; and it is friendly to every thing that is friendly to man's welfare. It is the illuminator, the emancipator, the regenerator of the universe. Its foundation is eternal truth; its effects are the joys of Heaven itself; and it stands alone, the fairest visitant of earth,—the loveliest offspring of the skies,—the bright effulgence of eternal light,—the best, the mightiest, the universal, and the eternal friend of man."

The foregoing beautiful extract, uttered by our friend Barker, when he was a Christian, shows how happy he was then. He has changed his position now, but is he as happy now as then? If he is, we entirely failed to discover it at the late Convention.

———o———

DANSVILLE, N. Y.—We have been desired to visit there in October. If the Lord will, we will spend the 2d and 3d Sabbaths of that month there.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VIII. NEW YORK, AUGUST, 1853. NO. 8.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 140 Fulton-street, (Up Stairs.)

TERMS.--Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS.

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM.

(*Continued from page* 93.)

THE history is plainly told. The manifestation of the Lord Jesus Christ was for great purposes of divine mercy towards the human race. He came to rescue the human race from the tyranny of sin,—to strike off the sordid spiritual shackles which debased and destroyed mankind, by holding them in a foul moral bondage, and restraining them within the dominions of the dead. His mission was that of a "Restorer." He came to re-create a race for God, worthy to be honored as sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty. The materials of this new creation were a morally diseased and mortal race, called by an apostle "the body of sin" and "death." Such a race needed to be impregnated with a new spirit,—the spirit of holiness; and vitalized with a new life,—an incorruptible and immortal life. Sin, which had usurped the throne in the moral constitution, had to be entirely supplanted by an in-dwelling, regnant holiness; and the exposure to death had to be repaired by a resurrection, and immortal nature. "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." A work of Almighty Power and the project of Infinite Mercy! To accomplish this vast work a peculiar as well as potent system of means was devised, which develops the wonderful resources of God in its admirable adaptation and efficacy. God would give a more special and perfect revelation of himself than he had ever before given: he would accommodate himself, even more than he had heretofore done, to the condition and necessities of the race whom he purposed to redeem.

It is beside our purpose to discuss here the probabilities of a revelation other than God has already given of himself in the vast scope of his material creation. We take for granted, as a matter of fact, and capable of a rational and satisfactory proof, that a more direct and particular revelation has been graciously condescended by God to mankind, and that the Holy Scriptures contain the record of it. In them we have the wonderful history of this more special revelation, and are led to observe that one universal law of the Divine manifestation obtains in both systems. This law is, that God does not reveal himself directly, or *in propria persona*, but indirectly, through material and other media. It is not perhaps presuming too much to say that this medial mode of manifestation is the only mode by which God could hold intercourse with such beings as ourselves. Certainly, since such a mode has been chosen, we may suppose that it is the best and most suitable for the purpose. But the operation of this law discloses another interesting fact in connexion with the more special revelation of God to his creatures. There is observable a progression towards a higher and more perfect expression of God in the successive dispensations of revealed religion. In the patriarchal era the divine media of communication were the ministry of angels, visions, and dreams. Under the Mosaic dispensation, besides the written law, we behold an elaborate ceremonial and ritual, and a symbolic representation of Jehovah himself sojourning in the midst of, but unseen by, his people. No angel ministry, vision, or dream conveyed so vivid and delightful a conception of God as did the mysterious light, or Shekinah, the emblem of the pure and benignant Deity, resting above the ark of the Covenant on a Seat of Mercy. There was no possibility of misunderstanding the attitude of God towards his people in this expressive symbol. Here was an emblematic residence of God among men, and in his chosen attribute of the Merciful One. From that symbolic presence there came through the lips of the High Priest of Israel, the assurance of pardon and acceptance to the chosen people. Every expression of repentance and pledge of reformation which the reeking sacrifice symbolized, was followed by the assurance to the worshipper that his offering had obtained the atonement or reconciliation, and that he might retire from the sanctuary rejoicing that "there is forgiveness with God." But expressive as was that vision of God which the ancient Israelites enjoyed in their sacred institutes, the teachings of their prophets, and the series of extraordinary providences by which their national history is distinguished, it gave place in its turn to the higher manifestation of the dispensation which followed. Glorious as was confessedly that manifestation of the invisible Jehovah, it had comparatively no glory, by reason of the glory which excelleth. The last, or Christian dispensation, presents the most perfect revelation which God has ever made of himself to the human race. The manifestation of God culminated when Christ became the medium. "God was in Christ,"—a personal reality holding personal intercourse with men,—dwelling in very deed with men upon the earth. In Christ we learn to know God, by the character which he acts before us,—we see God in him through the higher medium of a living presence. In Christ we become acquainted with God in a way singularly appropriate and natural to us,—in that facile and perfect way by which we become acquainted with one another,—by looking upon, by conversing, by associating and living with him. The expression which only a human face, a human heart, a human life can give to beings themselves human,—even such an expression of the

invisible Jehovah has been granted us by God in Christ. "For the Life was manifested, and we have seen it; and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." So perfect is this manifestation of God in Christ, that our Lord said to his disciples, "If ye had known me ye should have known my Father also; and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him."

If what we have already said, appear to imply that we regard Christ in no higher capacity than a human medium, or living symbol for the manifestation of God, let it be distinctly understood that we consider such a representation of Christ as falling very far short of the representation which is given of him in the Scriptures. Our description of Christ as the medium, or mediator, for the purpose of manifesting God to men, under the last dispensation of religion, in which official capacity we trace an analogy to the economy of former dispensations, wherein a system of Divine revelation by the agency of symbolic media develops itself, by no means necessitates the conclusion, that Christ, as the one comprehensive medium of manifestation under the Christian dispensation, is no more than a human symbol. The revelation of God by Christ, while it develops a medial or mediatorial economy, and thus far corresponds with former dispensations, is yet a revelation altogether *sui generis*. He is not to be estimated as merely the last and grandest link in the chain of the medial manifestation of God; for although he fulfils the purpose of the last link in this wonderful economy, he is infinitely more than this would imply. Although chronologically last, the medial manifestation of God through Christ was the summary and supersedence of all preceding manifestations. It was the economy for "the fulness of times." His high mission was planned "before the foundation of the world," and the lesser manifestations were designed to be the progressive steps upon which were chiselled the suggestive yet faint outlines of the perfect "top-stone." Theirs was "the path of the shining light, shining more and more unto the perfect day."

And while we are anxious to anticipate and repel the possible imputation of receiving Christ in the capacity of a mere human symbol, we are yet farther desirous of repudiating the supposition that Christ was nothing more than a *moral* manifestation of God. To express in a human life the moral perfections of God, his disposition towards, and requirements of, his creatures was, undoubtedly, a chief design of the Messiah's mission. But this was not all; for we discover phenomena in the person and ministry of Christ for which no reason can be assigned, if we accept this as the sum of his mission, as the expression or manifestation of the Divinity. The Christ of the New Testament is not so easily brought within the comprehension of the human understanding as this representation allows him to be. There is an obvious mystery, natural and unstudied, investing him in the evangelic narratives, not to acknowledge which is to preclude ourselves from the true perception of his official character and dignity. We could conceive it possible for the power of God to raise up a perfect human being, who should be holy and without blemish from the earliest moment of his moral consciousness, and who in a life of elevated purity and activity should develop even such moral perfectibility as did Christ himself. But such a being however qualified for the purposes of a merely moral manifestation of God, would come far short of the official dignity of Christ, who embraced in himself a complete expression of God, in so far as this was necessary for the ends which the Divine Being contemplated in so expressing himself to his creatures, and in so far, moreover, as it was possible, submitting as Christ did, in assuming the human form as the chosen vehicle of the manifestation, to the laws and limitations of a finite nature. That man may be an intelligent and devout worshipper he needs to know the object of his worship, and God has condescended to grant him this knowledge. Absolute Deity man has never seen, and necessarily cannot see. "No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." The nature of God is too vast to be comprehended, in its absolute vastness, by man. He has no faculties for the perfect apprehension of essential Deity. There are but two methods by which the nature of God can be brought at all within the capacity of the human understanding: either the human must become the Divine, or the Divine must become the human. The former is impossible: is the latter impossible also? Is it impossible for God to collect, so to speak, the infinite rays of his being into a limited and less dazzling focus? Can he reflect himself in such a way as that the reflection shall be a perfect image of himself? Is it competent for God to reproduce himself, not of course essentially and personally, but representatively, on another and reduced scale,—a scale that shall be on a level with the capacities of the being to whom he may purpose to reveal himself? We think it is, and that it is *thus* that God has chosen to manifest himself to man, in the person and mission of the Lord Jesus Christ. God, we believe, shines forth in Christ in the plenitude of his divine grandeur and majesty. "In him dwelleth *all the fulness* of the Godhead *bodily*." Here is language which unequivocally expresses, not a partial, but the *complete* expression of God in or through humanity. It represents Christ as the model of God, the visible personification of the invisible Jehovah. And this is the Apostle's chosen figure, by which to express the true idea of Christ, "the *image* of the invisible God;" still more emphatically, "the *express image* of his person." "God was *in* Christ" representatively, and for the purpose of medially, or mediatorially manifesting himself to mankind.

This idea of Christ will, we think, be found to adapt itself to, and to explain, all the phenomena of his person and mission. It has already been stated that the evangelical records invest the person of Christ, to some extent, in an impenetrable veil of mystery. While he draws us to himself "with the cords of love, the bands of a man," we cannot divest ourselves of the consciousness that between us and him, notwithstanding this privileged and intimite oneness, there is yet a distance so vast as to be scarcely, if at all, other than infinite. The endearments of friendship and fraternity, which his condescension obliges us to feel and to acknowledge, cannot obliterate the sense of awe with which we draw nigh to him. We call him our brother, our friend; but do we not feel, while such terms are on our lips, that he is such by gracious and un-

speakable condescension? Are we not conscious all the while of another emotion underlying this emotion of brotherhood, and which we feel owes its birth to some *other* conviction than that Christ is our brother? And if we were to analyze this deeper feeling, shall we not find it to be akin to that hallowed feeling with which we venerate the Supreme God himself? Nay, more: can our analysis show that the feeling is not really identical? No reiteration of his designation as "the son of *man*" can force the mere manhood of Christ into the seat of our uppermost conviction. We *feel*, despite our theologies, that we are in the presence of God when the image of the immaculate Son is before our mental vision.* We may have different speculative theories, concerning the personal nature of Christ, and may variously explain our conceptions of it; but it is more than probable that our feelings are one, and that the feeling is such as we have stated. It might indeed be contended that even if such be the case, it is to be attributed to the influence of a false education, and that such a feeling is rather of traditional and spurious, than of a genuinely religious origin. But we cannot admit this, but believe that it is the genuine product of the evangelical records, with whose historic details we are so generally familiar.

Let us not be misapprehended in these remarks. We pronounce not on the *personality* of the Son of God, we remember that it is written, "No man knoweth who the Son is but the Father." Our anxiety is to overlook none of the phenomena which the person and life of Christ present. Our views of the mission of Christ oblige us to reject that presumptuous Creed known as the Athanasian, on the one hand, and on the other, that low one-sided theory which professes to explain the Christ of the Scriptures by placing him in the category of mere humanity only.† We find *mystery* here, and believe that the clue will never be found, by following which we shall be led into the secret recesses of Christ's personal being, and be able to publish to the world any theory of his wonderful nature.

It is not in the presumptuous attitude of the anatomist that we presume to stand before the Christ of God, and with the scalpel of our intellect attempt the dissection of his peculiar being. We believe this to be neither the proper, nor a devout attitude for us to assume. We welcome Christ, not as a problem to be solved, but as a prophet to be believed in; not as a metaphysical phenomenon, but as the messenger of the Lord of Hosts; not as a physical subtilty, but as a Prince and a Saviour. We receive the Lord Jesus Christ, not as an appeal to our speculative curiosity, but as designed to lead us to a sublime conviction, and lay within us the foundation of a living faith.

Such are our views of Christ, and the purpose of his manifestation. We hail his advent as that of the last and greatest of the Prophets of God,—commissioned, and alone qualified to fulfil, the beneficent intentions of his Almighty Father, concerning our fallen race. His approach excites, not our speculative curiosity, but our hope of salvation. The phenomena of his person is with us a subject of secondary interest to the momentous fact, that he is a special visitor from the unseen world, sent with the powers and privileges of a Plenipotentiary of God, to effect our personal salvation from sin and its wages,—death. The all-engrossing thought is, that this distinguished person has come from the very bosom of our Father in heaven, into whose secret counsels he is specially admitted, and which, so far as they concern mankind, he alone is able to make known. He has come to correct our imperfect notions of God, by giving on a human scale the real representation of him. He has come to destroy our fears, the wretched offspring of conscious guilt, by assuring us that his Father does not impute to the world their iniquities, but is willing to forgive and waiting to be gracious, and to declare that he is the medium, or mediatorial agent, of this spontaneous grace of pardon. "The Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins." He has come to display a spirit and life that shall be the pattern of our spirit and life, that we may be transformed into his own holy and perfect image, and thus be restored by him to the family of God, as sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty. He came to cleanse us from all in-dwelling sin, and wash away the foulness of our conscious corruption. Hence is he described as "the fountain opened for sin and uncleanness." He has come to be the plague of death, "the last enemy" of mankind, which he will finally and for ever triumph over, as "the Resurrection and the Life," when his quickening voice shall give his saints their new birth in a resurrection, or transformation, for the inheritance of eternal life. Such are our views of Christ. We rejoice in him as our *Justifier*,—for he has proclaimed our pardon on the simple, gracious conditions of repentance towards God, and faith in himself. We rejoice in him as our *Sanctifier*,—for he has washed us from our personal sins at the cost of his own blood, teaching us, by his own perfect example to "resist unto blood, striving against sin." We rejoice in him as our *Redeemer*, for through him death has no final dominion over us; he ever liveth, and because he lives we shall live also. He is our light; for in him we see the glory of the unseen God, and the beauty of holiness. He is our Life; for *by* him are we made

---

* Philo Judæus, who was contemporary with our Lord, has the following remark respecting the Logos, or medium of the Divine manifestation: "The Divine Word.... exists as the Image of God,.... *fixed the nearest, there being no intervening existence*, to the Only One, who is self-existent."—*Dr. Pye Smith's Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, vol. i. p. 582.

The Greek in John's Gospel translated "*with* God," is *pros ton Theon*, which expresses the same idea as that above. The idea of the preposition *pros* is that of *nearness*, bordering upon, yet not absolute *identity; likeness* without *sameness*. It is difficult to give the precise force of the expression; but our English translation, "the Word was *with* God," certainly fails to give the emphatic force of the original, which signifies *a union as intimate* as is conceivable without blending into actual *unity*.

† If Christ had been a *mere man*, it would have been ridiculous in *him* to call himself "the son of man;".... so, if Christ had been a mere man, his saying, "My Father is greater than I," would have been as unmeaning. It would be laughable enough, for example, to hear me say, "My 'Remorse' succeeded, indeed, but Shakspeare is a greater dramatist than I." But how immeasurably more foolish, more monstrous would it not be for a *man*, however honest, good, or wise, to say, "But Jehovah is greater than I!"—*Coleridge*.

meet for an eternal existence in the society of the holy and immortal; *through* him do we receive our resurrection from the dead; and *in* him and *with* him shall we ever abide, joint heirs of immortality. Christ to us is "the power of God and the wisdom of God" for salvation. The mystery of his person we will be content to receive as a necessary but inexplicable part of his great mission of love.

(*To be Continued.*)

ÆTERNITAS REVIEWED.

BY REV. WM. G. MONCRIEFF.

"ÆTERNITAS: *or, Glimpses of the Future Destinies of Man.* By Wm. Bathgate."

(Continued from page 83.)

We closed our last article of this series with an expression of anxiety to know what is the soul of man, or what is a human soul? Our author gives us his deliverance on the subject, and we might find a great many testimonies, backed by lofty names, in ancient and modern times, to the same effect, or nearly so. Indeed "Æternitas" merely echoes what has been uttered again and again, and is believed by millions as firmly as the dogmas of purgatory and transmigration are accredited in Rome and Benares. The one thing needful is authority to give weight to all these authorities; a voice that will sanction each of these assertions, in which we may unerringly and most securely confide. As a theologian, it was the author's duty to hasten at once to the Volume of the Book, and show us distinctly what is there meant by a "soul;" this he has not done, indeed, it never seems to have entered his mind that there was any need for the service. We listen to human assertion; the Bible is never consulted. We hear a mortal's voice; but what we want to hear, and what must be heard, is the voice of God.

Nothing can be plainer than the seventh verse of Gen. ii:—"the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man *became* a living soul." Mark the word, he "*became*"—not he got—but he became a living soul. Man was made of dust, and when the breath of life was put into his nostrils, or when he was caused to breathe, henceforth he was a LIVING SOUL. Any child can see the difference between a soul being put into a body, as a tenant enters his new habitation, and an organized creature stretched on the floor of Eden, a lifeless soul, and the same creature by a specified process, becoming a soul alive, and thereupon beginning to perform all the functions peculiar to his rank in the universe.

With this account of Adam's creation, that of the Mother of us all may be compared, and it is wide as the poles from what the common notions about the human constitution would lead us to expect. Immaterial she is not. Nothing is mentioned in her case, as in his, *except organization*, formed of existing world elements. "And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept; and he took one of his *ribs*, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; and the rib which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man." Gen. ii. 21, 22. The Scripture description of a human being is "dust THOU art," and to declare that this only means a part of him, —in fact not even so much as a part of him, since *he* is as different from it as the dwelling is from the owner, is to pervert the truth at the bidding of a dogma which has been enthroned in the temple of our divine religion.

A soul, then, is no mystery, in so far as its origin or composition is concerned. It can "be seen, touched, measured, or weighed." The wings of fancy are not stimulated by its contemplation;—we are saved the necessity of asking, "Art thou anything?" If we have lost a great deal of dream-stuff in our research, we have exchanged it for substantial facts, delivered to us by the surest authority. Enough of wonder is left, that out of dust such a complex being could be formed,—a being capable of such varied and sublime functions,—such intense sufferings and enjoyments. Jehovah is wonderful in counsel, and excellent in working!

But the whole subject may be rendered somewhat plainer, if we inquire, what is meant by man being a soul? The word "soul" is the English translation of the Hebrew *nephesh*, and this word comes from a verb signifying to breathe. Man is a *nephesh*, a soul, then, because he lives by breathing; so the term *nephesh* does not so much indicate what he is in the elements of his being, as the mode in which he is continued in living existence. Man became a living soul, or living creature; a creature to live by breathing vital air.

But, further, since on this account he is a soul, we may reasonably expect that all creatures in the world living in the same manner, will also bear a kindred designation. This is the fact. In the following passages the same word occurs, and it is employed to describe the inferior orders of animal existence. Gen. i. 21, "and God created great whales, and every living creature," (*nephesh*); verse 24th, "Let the earth bring forth the living creature" (*nephesh*); Gen. ii. 19, "Whatsoever Adam called every living creature," (*nephesh*); Gen. ix. 10, "Every living creature (*nephesh*) that is with you"; Lev. xi. 46, "this is the law . . . . of every living creature (*nephesh*) that moveth in the waters." Every animal living by breathing then, is a *nephesh*, —a soul,—as certainly as man is; and he is no more soul than they are. They are, in fine, all souls, because they have life maintained by inspiring the common electrified atmosphere, which is therefore called the breath, or spirit of lives. Gen. vi. 17, 22. Ecc. iii. 19. Man's superiority above the other breathing tribes consists not in his being a "soul," but in the magnitude of his powers; in other words, in the loftier position he occupies in the scale of existence as an intellectual, moral, and responsible agent. These humbler souls differ from one another: some tribes have more intelligence, and a greater complexity of structure than others, but he towers above them all. "What a work is man! How noble in reason! How exalted in faculties! In form and motion how express and admirable! in apprehension how like a god!—the wonder of the world!—the paragon of animals!"

It might be useful to show that Scripture throughout is harmonious in its teaching with the creation record concerning the material and organic nature of man. We are "dust" and "but flesh"; never are we said to be spirits dwelling in organic

habitations. Much as we hear about "the spirit being the man," the Bible uses no such language, and associates human personality, in page after page, with what the eye can see, and the hand can handle. Indeed the Scriptural fact, which is now beginning by writers in this controversy to be acknowledged, that all breathing creatures are souls, is enough to convince the world that there must have been an unmeasured quantity of nonsense uttered about the human soul, and many a long argument spun to connect man as a soul with the exalted and the everlasting, which turn out to be no better than ropes of sand. "A soul cannot die," "a soul cannot sleep," "a soul must live forever," are rather common expressions, and if they are worth anything as far as man is concerned, they are equally so with regard to the meanest beast that runs, or insect that divides the liquid air. The dog as well as the man is a soul. Can he not die? Can he not sleep? Must he live for ever? Ere long, his breath, *ruach*, will go forth, and he will return to his native dust. Can more be said of man? Can less? We have all one breath, we are all of the dust. When the Great Proprietor summons back the life he has given us, which life is but a vapour, the shadows of the grave gather around us, and whether they are ever again to be scattered, is the grand problem which revelation professes to solve. "If," says our author, "there be nothing more in man but flesh and blood, then his entire mortality is settled." p. 43. And settled it is—if we are to abide by the record. A resurrection man may have, yea, even a resurrection to immortal being every one may receive,—and the teaching of the Word on these points we shall by and by consider; but that he is now immortal, and that he in any sense survives death in a continued uninterrupted consciousness, notwithstanding all his gifts, faculties, and capabilities, is utterly without foundation. When a house can be in ruins, and at the same time, entire—when a harp can be unstrung, and yet give forth its tones—then, man may be dissolved, and yet be entire:—his powers be in active exercise, when the organism has mouldered into dust. Being material—flesh and blood, his entire mortality is demonstrated, and the labor to prove him deathless has been expended in vain. The sentence, "unto dust shalt THOU return," is no mockery; the affirmations, "man dieth and wasteth away," are no deception:—on the contrary, they are stern and awful facts, which orthodoxy is most loath to admit. No elixir can preserve these transient souls from decay: no spices from India and "Araby the blest," can hinder their resolution into their original elements. "Corruptible man" must bow, like the other organisms around him, to the inevitable law: the hare-bell and the rainbow, are emblems of his frailty. "The glory of man is as the flower of the grass."

Man's being "but flesh and blood,—material in his constitution—is about as unwelcome a statement as can be uttered in the ears of spiritualistic orthodoxy. It may be so, but it must be heard. We are not, kind reader, speculating when we announce it; interpretation is all that the case requires. Yea, we are so bold as to aver, that the speculative tendency is all on the other side. As interpreters we ask reverentially at the Divine Oracle, "What is man?" And the answer cometh forth "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground." With this we are content, and if we had not an intention of regarding the answer as satisfactory, why did we go to the Oracle at all? Had we found no information as to what man was made of, had we seen all left in inextricable confusion, we might have forthwith commenced to speculate as to where thought in him originated, and perhaps summoned into his origination some immaterial and inscrutable nondescript entity, after the fashion of the popular "soul," or "spirit," to account for his mentalizing functions; but we detect no need to waste our energies in this undertaking when the Book is so explicit. Often do we hear the words "matter cannot think," and the trumpet of orthodoxy summons us to attend. In our simplicity we have been led to reason thus: matter cannot think—God made man of the dust of the ground—then of course man cannot think! He may grow like a palm tree, but can reason no more than it. Now this argumentation seems really valid, and yet every human being in his senses laughs it to scorn. I do think, is the protest of each child of humanity,—then if you do, we respond, in your case matter must perform the function of reflection and kindred operations. More than living organization you are not, and if you declare living organized matter incapable of thought, we are bound to infer that you have no thought at all. Accepting your premises, we must hand you the conclusion. The logic is good, but we are generous enough to allow that we cannot subscribe it.

It has often occurred to us as a fair procedure, just for the sake of bringing orthodoxy to a stand, to assert that spirit cannot think; of course, we are only referring to created beings, on this occasion. We have often tried to understand the popular idea of a spirit; and we must confess, that it defies our apprehension. It is something, nothing; a substance, an essence; everything by turns, and nothing long. To believe that such a production could evolve thought, is an inordinate demand on human credulity. How the expedient was resorted to, we cannot tell: was it because thought is invisible, that this invisible parent was sought for it? Then, why not trace heat beyond the fire, perfume beyond the rose, attraction beyond the sun, and vitality beyond the branchy oak? Of all insane fancies, this human spirit is the most complete; we have no wish to give offence, but the truth must be spoken.

"Matter cannot think;" who said so? Is there a man on earth, who would have the audacity to affirm, that Almighty God cannot make living matter evolve thought? We once asked that question of a reverend defender of spiritualism, and he was dumb. When the Creator announces that man's brain, or, if you please, the organized being—man, cannot manifest thought, it will be time to seek some other cause to explain his higher and sublimer functions. When we are informed that man is dust, and that at death his very thoughts perish, had it not been for the deplorable infusion of the heathenish element into the church, the dreams about human souls, and spirits would long ago have been universally regarded by the students of the Word as another evidence of the tendency of poor humanity to wander farther and farther into the wilderness of delusion, unless guided by light from the Eternal Throne.

Look through this microscope, friend, and watch the myriads of animalcules in the drop of water, submitted to inspection. They are so small, that Ehrenberg has computed that not fewer than five

hundred millions can subsist in a quantity of water like that under your view; each of these monads has its appropriate organs, possesses spontaneous power of motion, and enjoys an independent vitality. Watch them, and you see will, and desire, and anger, and affection; and yet I suppose each of them is held wisely to be a unity; no need is seen, by competent judges, for a thinking spirit to act, by their vile organization. Here is matter—a very speck itself, invisible to the naked eye—endowed with forces of thought, and volition, and passion, which, though limited in their compass, are indisputable and astonishing realities. What the Almighty can effect on a lowly platform, cannot he accomplish on a higher and broader one? From studying the microscopic creatures, turn attention to the fish, the dog, the elephant, the eagle, and we see similar, and higher manifestations of cerebral function, or mentalizing. To assert that they have all more than material organization, is to assume what has never been proved to be necessary; and which never can. It may suit a whim, a dogma, a system, to announce, oracularly, that the fish must have a thinking soul, and so must the stork, and so must the tiger: but philosophy is of sterner stuff; and on the side of philosophy, is here found the angel of piety; and they both demand,—Are you not content with what Omnipotence has given? Can you not admire him in producing thought from organization, as well as from some mysterious indweller, called by you a "soul?"

In general, however, there is no special necessity avowed for a thought producing soul bearing the popular stamp, till we come to man. The monads, the monkeys; the lambs and the lions can shift very well without it, but man must have this inexplicable endowment, yea, *be* a "soul" without organization, an airy nothing now incarnate, and soon to be discharged into the bounds of space. Brain, and nerve matter, can produce animalcule-thought, and lion-thought, and elephant-thought; but is incompetent to evolve man-thought: at this stage the Creator was baffled, or the elements were too vulgar and too cheap, when a responsible agent was to be awoke into consciousness and activity. So dreams the benighted wisdom of men styled philosophers and theologians; and we turn with pleasure to the old, but valuable record, "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground!" and profess ourselves content to have a place among the breathing creatures,—the living souls,—that people this section of the universe along with us. We are one with them in the brotherhood of organizations, formed and attuned by the hand of Omnipotence, and inasmuch as we are gifted more richly, and have a destiny, hereafter sublimer than theirs brought within our grasp, we try to extol him the more acceptably, and "by patient continuance in well doing to seek for glory, and honor, and immortality." Had he pleased, notwithstanding all our powers, and longings, and capacities, he might have permitted the grim messenger to lead us, as he conducts the lowly ones around us, into the halls of silence never to be disturbed by the pealing notes of the resurrection trumpet; but since he has otherwise resolved, and since the hope of an incorruptible revival is disclosed for our encouragement, we discover the greatness of his philanthropy, and desire to be made meet for the unfading crown.

(To be Continued.)

HUMAN MATERIALISM.

BY WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, SCOTLAND.

It is not long since a friend of ours told us with much gravity that some ministers, whom he named, were in the habit of experimenting on a clairvoyant, and that the said clairvoyant was wont to see in heaven well known pious individuals recently deceased, and, if memory fails us not, he added, the clear-seer likewise held converse with these disembodied saints, old and young. This he appeared to think was mighty confirmation to the common opinion about separate spirits, or souls, and it certainly had been handed to him to establish his faith on that point. Persons but partially acquainted with the phenomena of mesmerism, are very apt to be deceived by such statements, and put the fancies of an extatic or a clairvoyant on a level with indisputable facts. As far as our knowledge extends, even those who have faith in clairvoyance, and profess to have witnessed most of it, acknowledge that not one word uttered by persons in the clear-seeing state can be in itself depended on; it must be confirmed by inquiry before it can be regarded as anything else than innocent delusive imaginings. Now suppose one in a natural or artificial clairvoyant condition, to affirm that he sees and maintains converse with departed friends or strangers, would it not appear wise for men, at least men avowing a belief in revelation, to enquire at its columns what it has to declare about the constitution of man, is he material or spiritual? and about the situation of the dead? These treatises "soul" and "spirit" may perhaps enable enquirers to judge what the Word represents a man to be; and declarations like these, "the dead know not anything," "the dead praise not the Lord," &c., seem enough to make a considerate man stagger at the pretended visions by clairvoyants of human spirits, and conversations said to have been held with them. What source of information as to the invisible have we save the Book? Have the doors of eternity been opened to our tread? Can we ascend and search the courts of heaven for those who have gone hence, and are by orthodoxy affirmed to be there? When a clairvoyant says a quantity of stolen gold lies in a particular locality, it is easy to confirm or disprove the statement; but who can determine the accuracy of his affirmations about dead men? since it is confessed the realm of the unseen is not reachable by us, so as that such declarations can be calmly and philosophically tested. But more than this, as doctors are said to differ, it is a notorious fact that with regard to the unseen and the future, clairvoyants differ also. In No. XXXVI of the Zoist, there is a conversation by the Rev. Mr. Townhend, London and Lausane, which he held in Paris with Alexis Didier, a famous clairvoyant. Among other things the Rev. gentleman records, "Partly misunderstanding a question of mine, he assured me he *knew nothing* of the state of the soul *after death. Dieu seul le sait* (God only knows), said he." "It is true," he continued, "many somnambulists *pretend* to make revelations about a future state. *But the proof they are all wrong is that no two of them agree: all give different accounts*," p. 409. We may further state, that in another number

of the same magazine, there is a review of a French work by M. Alphonse Cahagnet, well deserving an attentive perusal. The review is able, calm, and instructive; it demolishes the erections framed from clairvoyant fancies with admirable logic and success. The writer,—the Rev. G. Sandby, Vicar of Flexton, Suffolk,—is a pious man who does not wish the future and its hopes to be established on *dreams*, but on a surer word of prophecy to which we do well to take heed. Let us make a few quotations, more particularly as the magazine may not be easily found by many of our readers. We should state, perhaps, that Mr. Sandby is a believer in the common doctrine about the spirit of man, and this just the more increases the value of his remarks which are to be transcribed. It is not for the ideas of the writer about spirits, but for his judgment about these clairvoyant visions of spirits and conversations with them, that we quote his words—

"Now M. Cahagnet attaches great importance to these two cases, arguing, that if the spirits of *living* men ("great virtue in this is") could thus make their appearance and converse, it follows *a fortiori* that the spirits of those that are separated by death from the body must, with far greater probability, possess the same power, and that thus by these two cases we have acquired a certitude of all that he had hitherto asserted in this respect. The enthusiasm of M. Cahagnet prevents him from seeing that his own facts, it is to be feared, overturn his own hypothesis, and prove the unsubstantiality of his visions; for we must nail him and his followers down to these two cases, and bring their possibility to an easy test. For instance, these alleged communications were real or unreal; if real, and it be true that the spirits of these two men, the one resident in Mexico, and the other on the borders of China, could thus maintain a conversation with a somnambule, (and whether that the somnambule's spirit travelled to them, or that theirs travelled to the somnambule, is unimportant,) it is clear that the men themselves must have been conscious of the intercourse. The spirit, according to M. Cahagnet's own doctrine, is the actual man; it must have been the spirit, then, that spoke, and asserted that he was living; the reality, therefore, of the whole transaction is easy of proof. We do not want these two men to be fetched from afar to narrate their singular experiences; the fact can be tried nearer home. Let Adele one morning communicate after the same fashion with the spiritual part of some person resident in Paris or France,—let her hold a dialogue with them, as she did in Mexico and Russia,—and *unless these absent persons become conscious of the communication, and agree in the accuracy of the conversations in which they are supposed to take a part, the unreality of the assumed 'perception' is at once obvious, and we have incontestible proof that the whole is a mental delusion.*

"I contend, then, that we have in these two cases evidence conclusive that a *reflection* of persons or things can be so strongly mirrored on the brain by some power of concentration, as to assume the semblance of an actual embodiment. Now an effect, which I assume to be possible in respect of parties supposed to be living, can be equally possible in respect to parties supposed or known to be dead. The illusion in both instances is identical. The characteristics of each class of apparition are one and the same, and though we cannot prove that the spirits of the departed do not communicate with this lucid lady, as she so confidently asserts that they do, we can yet prove that the spirits of the living do no such thing (unless she fulfil the condition above referred to); and inasmuch as both communications fall under the same category, and are both attended by the same class of circumstantial and supposed facts, the nature of these visions becomes at once evident, and the refutation of the theory complete.

"To prove still more clearly the *reductio ad absurdum* to which this doctrine of apparitions is pushed by M. Cahagnet, I must furnish you with one more case before I leave this part of the subject, for it clearly marks the true character of these visions; for if there were any apparition at all in the following story, it was an *apparition of spirits by the legion.*

"Madam Osborn (v. II. p. 199) receives from Adele a description of the death of an uncle, who had died in battle some years before. The ecstatic sees the whole battle in action; she sees the uncle struck down by a cannon ball; she hears the sound of the cannon when it is fired, and feels an inexplicable oppression at the noise. Now so far as I can understand the above facts, they are remarkable instances of the *power of imagination upon the brain* in that *sensitive state when clairvoyance is in action;* but M. Cahagnet regards them as proofs of a spiritual existence. Either, then, he must believe that the spirits of all those that were engaged in the conflict were so obliging as actually to re-appear before Adele, and to fight their battle over again for her instruction; in which case, his belief is comprehensive enough, and he must certainly regard the world of spirits as marvellously condescending, *or*, if he admit that *any part of the above vision* were but a picture on the brain, he admits the possibility of a spectral illusion, and the argument on his side is closed at once. For everything else that he has mentioned may equally be the same sort of cerebral deception, and one spirit is no more real than another.

* * * * * * *

"I was noting down for comment the points in which these volumes differed from the disclosures given through Davis and Madam Hauffe, but more especially the manifest discrepancies that existed in the volumes themselves, when I suddenly came upon a piece of information that at once relieved me of this labor. The 'Revelations' are, in fact, scarcely revelations. The contradictions, in short, are so palpable, that they are at once admitted, and our author gives the explanation. It is this—it is not that the spirits are 'lying spirits,' but that the fancies, the feelings, the studies, the pursuits, the society, nay, the religious and philosophical notions of this life so accompany the spirit on his arrival into the other, that he is scarcely more instructed upon any single point than we are; so that, in fact, when we receive a communication from him, his statements are so colored by his antecedent habits and opinions, that we not only do not obtain the absolute truth, but not always an approximation to it. In other words, a Jew seems to remain a Jew, a Catholic, a Catholic; and a miser to be as fond of gold as before; and thus disclosures, which are magnificently put forth as being the secrets of the future unveiled, turn out to be a mass of misstatements, on the accuracy of which not the slightest

reliance can be placed. Truly, a most lame and impotent explanation! but it illustrates what I have before advanced, that Adele, as she progressed, *improved* greatly upon her first communications; and the reason is obvious: somnambules who talk much require good memories. The consistency of their statements is sure to fail them sooner or later." —*Zoist*, *No.* 28, *pp.* 426–429.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, AUGUST, 1853.

THE AWAKENING BEGUN.—*The Bible Examiner* has for years uttered a note of warning to the churches, that unless they awoke from their slumbers and reformed their theology, skepticism and infidelity would overwhelm them, and sweep them as with the besom of destruction. But we have as often been met with scorn and sneers. At last, however, there seems to be one symptom of a waking up on this subject. Under the head of "*Modern Skepticism*," "The Independent," of this city, for July 7th, has an article that gives signs of the revival of common sense against the traditions and superstitions of past centuries. The Independent is "Conducted by Pastors of Congregational Churches," and published weekly. The article before us opens with a lament that "*teachers* are sometimes those who know least about the public mind." It then proceeds to say:

"We believe that a great change is preparing in religious opinion, of which these and many of our best men know nothing. To those who are thrown into the currents of life, it is evident that men's minds are in unusual working, and that the very foundations of Religious Belief are rotten and shaking. Among all the earnest-minded young men who are at this moment leading in thought and action in America, we venture to say that four-fifths are skeptical even of the great historical facts of Christianity. What is told as Christian doctrine by the churches, is not even considered by them. And furthermore, there is among them a general ill concealed distrust of the clerical body as a class, and an utter disgust with the very aspect of Christianity and of church worship. This Skepticism is not flippant; little is said about it. It is not a peculiarity alone of the radicals and fanatics; many of them are men of calm and even balance of mind, and belong to no class of ultraists. It is not worldly and selfish. The doubters lead in the bravest and most self-denying enterprizes of the day. It is not an Unbelief to be laughed, or hooted at, or hunted down. It is calm, abiding, earnest, sorrowful. Not much is known of it above; but it underlies now all the strongest and external movement. There are, however, glimpses of it. You see it in the daily diminishing influence of the Pulpit, and the increasing influence of the Press; in the lessening number of strong and original minds who take hold of Theology, and the tone of the men who are leading American thought. It speaks in these strange longings for new revelations, and in the occasional denunciations of the old. To us it seems strange that those Christian men should be boasting about church-organizations and technical dogmas, or be troubled about consistency with orthodox standards and catechisms, or anxious about the question of pastors' salaries, and what not, when the very ground and basis beneath our Christian Church is trembling to its depths—to be squabbling over uniforms and rations, when the very citadel is being sapped! For ourselves, we watch all this with painful suspense. Is the fate of Germany before us? Will the Unbelief creep out from the better minds who have held it among the masses, drying up all humane, and generous, and religious action, as it has done there? Shall the American mind sweep past the great anchorage-ground of humanity—the belief in God and an endless life—or shall it work out to a purer Christianity? Of these doubters and "Infidels" we could never speak harshly. To them often is their unbelief a sorrowful, solemn thing, even more than to us."

The article then proceeds to state some other facts of the development of this skepticism, and says: "As religion has presented itself to them, (the skeptics,) it is repellent and disgusting; and they would rather go in the blank Future, lonely and faithless, than violate their own instincts by receiving it." The writer then proceeds to inquire, "*Why all this?*" Among other things he says:

"The curse to the American mind, as we believe, has been the aspect presented in a portion of our theology of DEITY. *The God of some of our theologians is not a Being whom the human heart could either respect or love.* Men have ascribed acts and feelings to HIM which they would utterly revolt at in themselves or their fellows. We are not overstating. We know those with whom the memory of family prayer, early religious teaching, and Sabbath sermons is so entwined with the *picture of a hateful and repellent Deity*, that they loathe and reject, in consequence, the whole religion of their childhood. To them always the first unconscious thought which enters the mind concerning God, is the dread thought of the God of their Theology. Along with this, on every side weakening human faith, is the *Formalism* of present Christianity."

We would ask our friend of The Independent, how anything else than "*Formalism*" can grow from the "*picture of a hateful and repellent Deity*," such as he admits theologians represent their God—a God who has brought unnumbered millions of intellectual beings into existence, under the dreadful and fearful liability of an endless and eternally increasing torment and torture? *Such a God* deserves to be hated; and nothing but *formalism* can be practised in the professional approaches to him, unless you can shut out from the intellect such a horrid representation of his character. Never did Satan oppose so effectual an obstacle in the way of the *sincere* and *fervent* homage of the heart to God, as the lying representation we have just spoken of. Says Bishop Newton, in his "Dissertation," No. 60, "*On the Final State of Man*,"

"God is love, and he would rather not have given life, than render that life a torment and curse to all eternity. * * * Imagine a creature; nay, imagine numberless creatures produced out of nothing * * * delivered over to torments of endless ages, without the least hope or possibility of relaxation or redemption. *Imagine it you may, but you can never seriously believe it*, nor reconcile it to God and goodness." Such was the utterance of a great and good man, burdened with the *theological* representations of God and his purposes concerning man. This utterance is *skeptical;* but skeptical concerning *what?* of the truth of Christianity? *No:* but of the theological dogma of endless torture. And what mind not as hard as adamant, or as superstitious as the most servile Papal or Protestant devotee, would not be skeptical of the *theological blasphemy* of which we have spoken. Truly *it is* "The curse of American mind," and of all Christendom—that such "has been the aspect presented in a portion of our theology of DEITY:" and we are glad our friends of the "Independent" are waking up on the subject; and we entreat them not to stop in the *branches* of the poisonous tree, but go down to its *roots:* they will find them in the first utterance of Satan—"*Thou shalt not surely die.*"

—o—

"THE WHOLE TRUTH."—We remarked in the last Examiner that if we were called upon to act with the lately organized "*Evangelical Society*" we would rather they should *specify* what they consider "the *whole* truth" which they propose to publish; and that it was our preference to act in relation to some *neglected* truth where we could act in perfect agreement, so far as *associated* action could be employed, leaving each individual at perfect liberty to teach the *whole* truth according to his conviction of what it embraces. Br. Marsh, of the Advent Harbinger, in a very friendly manner objects to our view of the subject. He thinks it wrong and fraught with evil to "select any specific point or points of neglected truth to proclaim to the world, by the associated agency of any number of persons, or otherwise." By the *whole* truth, he says, he means "the same as *the word, the Gospel, the faith, the truth, the doctrine of God,*" &c. This, to us, is just as if he had said, "preach *the Bible.*" Well, that we intend to preach, and nothing else; but till men become *infallible*, or get an *infallible head*, such as the Romish Church *profess* to have, they "*know in part*," and hence must necessarily "*prophecy* [*teach*] in part:" so saith Paul, 1 Cor. 13: 9. And we do not think "that which is *perfect* is come" yet, or is likely to come till Jesus returns from heaven. Besides, Jesus taught his disciples, even while with them, "in part," and told them he had "many things to say unto them," but, said he, "ye cannot bear them *now.*" Then he did not preach to them "the *whole* truth" at once, but only such as was most *important* for them to know at a given time; leaving other truths to be developed in their natural order. Paul acted on the same principle of teaching in part, at first, for saith he, 1 Cor. 3: 2, "I have fed you with milk, and not with meat: for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able." What, Paul! not able to bear "the *whole* truth!" Truly "wisdom is profitable to direct." The whole truth is to be preached, but it may not always be by one man, nor at one time. One man may be able to bring out some truth, and especially some "*neglected* truth" which another is not yet qualified to do; and that man, if he acts in harmony with the providence of God in giving him light and ability on that subject, will make that neglected truth the *prominent* theme of his preaching. Others can preach familiar truths who are more statedly preaching in a particular place. Br. Marsh says, "We have *no right* to select any *specific point* or element of that *one gospel* to present to the people to the *neglect* of others, it is our duty to proclaim THE *Gospel* as a WHOLE, as the Lord has commanded."

Now this is true as a general principle; but is it true in specific cases? Did Br. Marsh, himself, feel it was binding on him, on his eastern tour last year? We think not, for he had for his principal theme what *he* regarded as a *neglected* truth, which occupied most of his time: it was right he should so preach, even though others might think it was no part of *the gospel.* To his own master he stands or falls.

We might greatly enlarge our remarks on Br. Marsh's other objections to association for promulgating a *neglected* truth, while other truths are left to ordinary efforts, but we wish not to make words on the subject. Let each and all act on these subjects according to their convictions of duty to God and his cause. Sure, we are, there can be no *associated* action, however "*Evangelical*" it may be called, and professedly embracing the *whole* truth, but it is liable to become a *sectarian* engine, whatever the movers intend. We therefore are of the same opinion as before, to go on in scattering light on the *Life theme;* each *individual* preacher being left perfectly free to preach on all other gospel topics whatever he judges necessary at the time and in the places he may visit; we, as a "*Provisionary Committee*," holding ourselves only responsible, in *aiding* him, for his preaching on that *theme.* Now, friends of the "Evangelical Society," "let there be no strife between us:" act in your

own way and we will do the same, and be at peace. *We* must be our own judges of our "*right* to select any specific *point* * * * to present to the people," responsible only to God.

—o—

POST OFFICE VIOLATIONS.—Some persons in sending us Newspapers or Pamphlets take the liberty to *write* on them or on the envelope. They should know that any writing, however trifling, beyond the mere direction, designed to give any information to the receiver, if it is only the name of the sender, subjects the paper or pamphlet, with the envelope to *letter* postage. We have been lead to speak of this now by seeing a note in "*The Christian Examiner and Bible Advocate*," published by J. Panton Ham, Bristol, England: it is as follows:—

"AN AMERICAN FRIEND sent us, during the past month, a publication of some kind, but through violating a law of our postal arrangements, we were deprived of the pleasure of its perusal. It contained writing within the wrapper, which brought it under the description of a letter, and was therefore charged *twelve shillings*, on which account we were obliged to return it to the office unopened. Our friends on both sides of the Atlantic, will oblige us by paying strict attention to this postal law—which requires that publications be left open at each end, and that neither the work itself nor its wrapper be written on."

—o—

"THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS."—We hope the articles on this subject, which we have commenced republishing in the *Examiner*, will be read with much care; they are much needed in these days. Br. Ham notices the commencement of our republication thus, in his last paper.

"GEORGE STORRS, New York.—We rejoice to see, by your publication, in the 'Bible Examiner,' of our articles on the 'Doctrine of the Cross,' that you are not disposed to exclude this important part of Christian doctrine from your valuable Magazine. If it be important to correct the popular errors on the subject of Immortality, it cannot be less important to disabuse the public mind of those God-dishonoring views which constitute the popular apprehension of the Cross. The 'Bible Examiner' will be the more valuable for teaching "Christ *crucified*,' as well as 'Christ our *Life*.' The misapprehensions about the *Cross* of Christ, are, in our humble opinion, far more injurious to personal piety and salvation than any other doctrinal apprehension whatever. May God speed you, dear brother, in your distinguished labors!"

Br. Ham will see by the Bible Examiner, several years ago, that we rejected the doctrine of *substitutionary* sufferings. We then said—and our mind has remained unchanged—that if Christ died as a *substitute*—"in our room and stead," or to "*pay our debts*," then is Universalism true; for nothing is plainer than that "Christ died *for all*." Besides, this doctrine of his dying as a substitute, or to pay our debts, robs God of the *privilege* of *forgiving* sins, and makes the "Lord's Prayer" an absurdity. "*Forgive us our debts.*" Jesus taught us to pray. If the doctrine of Christ's paying our debts is true, there is not, and, in the nature of the case, there can be no such thing as *forgiving* them, on God's part.

—o—

NOTICES OF VARIOUS WORKS.—"*The Christian Examiner and Bible Advocate*," for July, is received from Bro. Ham, Bristol, England: Also, "*The Expositor of Life and Immortality*," for July, from Bro. Moncrieff, Edinburgh, Scotland. Both these monthly magazines are good, and ably conducted. We hope they may be widely circulated and well sustained.

The "*Child's Friend*," published at Rochester, N. Y., by O. R. L. Crosier, comes to us in a new dress. It is a folio of four pages at 37 1-2 cents per year, published monthly. Four copies to one address for $1.

The "*Advent Harbinger*," published at Rochester, by Joseph Marsh, has also been treated with a new dress, and is much improved, *typographically*.

The "*Scripture Searcher*," Nos. 1 and 2, have been received: they are tracts of one page; each of which is headed by a particular subject, and the most important texts of Scripture relating to that subject arranged under sub-heads, so as to be easy of reference. It is a good idea. The two received are on "The Destiny of the Wicked," and "The State of the Dead," with ten sub-heads each. We presume the projector is Bro. H. L. Hastings, of Plymouth, Mass., though his name does not appear with them. Price 25 cents per 100. Published at 26 State-street, Hartford, Conn. They are to be followed by others.

"*The World: As it Was, Is, and Will Be:* By Mrs. A. C. Judson, Rochester, N. Y." A bound volume, to which is attached "The Gospel Hope," and other poems by Mrs. Judson, making about 200 pages, 18mo. We have received a copy of it from the authoress, for which she has our thanks. We hoped to have had time to read it before this, but have been able only to glance over it. It is chaste in its language, and we have no doubt interesting and instructive: more valuable than the ten thousand works so eagerly sought after, and read by the giddy youths, which are issued by most booksellers in these days. It can be had of the Authoress, Rochester, or of R. T. Young, 140 Fulton-street, New-York. The price we do not know, but suppose it is about 37 1-2 cents.

"*The Illustrated Water-Cure Journal*, and *The*

Illustrated Phrenological Almanac," for "1854," have been received from the "Publishers, Fowlers & Wells, New-York." These works, besides the usual Almanac uses, have a large amount of information on the topics indicated by their titles. Price 6 cents per copy, or 25 copies for $1.

—o—

"DEATH NOT LIFE: *or, The Theological Hell and Endless Misery Disproved, by a Collection and Explanation of all the Passages on Future Punishment; also, The Metaphysical Arguments for the Immortality of the Wicked Exploded.* By Jacob Blain, Baptist Minister, of Buffalo, N. Y."

"All the wicked will God *destroy;*" Ps. 145: 20.

"For yet a little while and the wicked *shall not be;*" Ps. 37: 10.

"They shall be as though they *had not been;*" Obediah 16.

For they "shall be punished with everlasting *destruction;*" 2 Thes. 1: 9.

Such is the *title page* of a work of some 120 pages, 12mo, to be issued in a few days. We think from what we have seen of it, it will prove a valuable help in spreading knowledge on the Life and Death theme. It will be found pretty cutting on theologians especially. The price most likely will be about 25 cents per copy, but we do not know certain. It is put up in *paper covers* only. Orders may be sent to us, New York; or to the Author, Buffalo, N. Y.

—o—

WAR.—"THE GREAT RIVER EUPHRATES."—Some there are who glory that they never change their views, though it often happens they are found mistaken; but they have the wonderful art of insisting they were right after all. We believe in changing whenever we see cause to do so, and frankly owning it too.

As the aspects for war in the East look threatening, and as it is almost certain that the Russian power is, at some future period, to come into Palestine, and be dreadfully overthrown there, it becomes a question of interest whether the period of that event has arrived? and whether the Ottoman Power is symbolized by the great river Euphrates, in Rev. 16: 12? We are strongly inclined, with present light, to answer both these questions in the *negative.*

That Russia is the *Gog* of Ezekiel 38 and 39, we see no reason to doubt; *Gog* being the ancient name of the kings of that northern country, as *Pharaoh* was that of the kings of Egypt. The invasion of the land of Israel, or Palestine, spoken of in the 38th chapter of Ezekiel, is at a time when "the desolate places are inhabited, and * * the people that are gathered out of the nations * * * dwell in the midst of the land * * * in unwalled villages * * * safely." If that "people" be the Jews, or a people typified by the Jews, so far as the fact is concerned, no such people dwell there *now;* and hence *this* is not *the time* of Ezekiel 38. If the *literal* Jews are to be in Palestine when that invasion takes place, then it would seem that one of two things must occur with Russian power prior to the invasion: either that power must itself undertake to put the Jews in possession of Palestine before it invades the land; or else it must receive such a defeat, by some means, as shall put it in the power of the Jews to leave Russia and go into Palestine. We are inclined, at present, to the view that Russia is destined to a terrible defeat first, which shall so break the pride of her power that the Jews shall be enabled to leave that northern quarter, where the hypocritical Emperor Nicholas now holds them in such complete slavery that they cannot remove from his dominions any more than an Algerine slave could escape. More than two millions of Jews are held in this condition in Russia. We shall not be surprised therefore, if we should find that *arch-hypocrite,* Nicholas, terribly defeated, if he continues his warfare on the Ottoman Empire.

But "the Ottoman Empire is to fall." True, sooner or later, as all other mere earthly powers are to fall. The supposition that the "great river Euphrates," Rev. 16, symbolizes the Ottoman Empire, we had supposed for years was an unquestionable fact, till this year. Our mind has, however, on this point, been undergoing a change for some months past. The harmony of symbols and the angelical exposition in Rev. 17, seem to forbid such a construction. The subject presented in Rev. 14: 8 to Rev. 20: 4, all has special reference to the overthrow of Babylon mystical, or *Papal Rome.* First, the *worshippers* of that power are threatened, 14: 9–11. Then the 15th chapter opens with the exhibition of "seven angels having *the seven* last plagues," in which "is *filled up* the wrath of God." Of course, these all belong to the beast power, or mystical Babylon, and are to accomplish its entire destruction. The 16th chapter contains an account of the pouring out of these seven vials or plagues. Few Protestants doubt but that *six* of them are inflicted on the beast, or Babylon power, though affecting other powers. The only question we wish to examine now is, Does the sixth vial belong to, or fall upon the Ottoman Empire, or is it, like the others, an infliction on Papal Rome, or mystic Babylon? We now incline to the belief it is the latter, and for the following reasons:

1. The general subject is the execution of the wrath of God on the mystic Babylon, or beast of Rev. 13th and 14th chapters; and we see not why the scene should be interrupted by a removal from Rome to Constantinople, or to the Ottoman Em-

2. The Harlot Babylon, at the opening of the judgment on her, Rev. 17: 1, is seen sitting "upon *many waters*:" and the sixth vial is to "*dry up waters.*"

3. Literal Babylon sat upon the great river Euphrates, and it was not till that river was turned from its channel, and the Euphrates was dried up that Babylon fell.

4. The *waters* on which mystical Babylon "sitteth," are, or have been, her protection, and would prevent her fall unless turned away from her as the waters of the Euphrates were from literal Babylon. These waters are expressly said, by the explaining angel, Rev. 17: 15, to be "*peoples*," &c.

5. The harmony of symbols requires that the *people* of Catholic Europe, especially of Italy, should be withdrawn from the support of mystic Babylon. It is now a well known fact that such a withdrawal has taken place, and that the Papal power is no longer sustained by the *people*—that source is "*dried up*," and she has taken refuge on the "scarlet colored beast," or *Napoleon Dynasty*. If that Dynasty refuses to sustain mystic Babylon, for any cause that may arise, she must have her flesh eat and be burned with fire—as sure she will in due time.

This view seems to give a harmony of all the symbols employed, and forbids the great river Euphrates being the symbol of the Ottoman Empire.

To show the fact of the withdrawal of *the people*, or the drying up of the waters on which mystic Babylon—Papacy—has in time past been seated, we give the following extract from a late speech of "Father Gavazzi" in this city. His subject was "Italy and the War against the Papacy." He said:—

"The Italians are only waiting for the first blow to be struck. * * * He said he would ask first, who has to make the war? God will do it, by helping the cause of the *people* trodden down for many centuries by most brutal despotism. The right of peace and war belong to the *people*; the citizens, not the President nor the King, shall declare whether war is just or unjust. He hoped that the Emperor of Russia, having become blinded by his autocratic power, would go on with the war, as this would furnish the occasion for the regeneration of *many people*. Turkey will be supported by *all men*, of *all nations*, and NICHOLAS will be cursed of God for all the blood which he shall cause to be shed. Italy, too, [i. e. *the people* symbolized by *the waters*,—ED. EXR.] shall rise; and no more, as in 1848, guided by traitors. They must rise like *one man*. * * * One thousand priests, one million of friars, seventy-two cardinals, will not prevent *twenty-four millions of people* from conquering their nationality. * * * * Better is war than peace with PIUS IX., and the BOURBON of Naples—that is the peace of slaves. King BOMBA and PIUS IX, are not the men of *the people*; they are two assassins; two cowards, who slaughtered *their people* for the sake of their power."

Such is the feeling of the masses of *the people* who have lived under Papal mis-rule; and Papacy is to have no more support from the "*many waters*"—they are "*dried up*"—*i. e.* their support is *withdrawn* from the Harlot Babylon and her judgments hasten on.

We have thrown out these thoughts, partially, to keep our readers from falling into a dogmatical and stereotyped system of interpreting prophecy, which comes to us with such *positive* assumptions. The fact is, we may all find that we "know but *in part*;" and while we study the unfulfilled prophecies let us speak as fallible men ought to speak, and express our conviction of their sense, acknowledging our liability to be mistaken in many things.

It may be that Russia in her warfare on Turkey is to meet with a terrible defeat which shall hinder her progress to Palestine, and open the way for Palestine to be in the state described Ezekiel 38. Till that is the case we think the probability is against her overrunning the Ottoman Empire; but events will shortly decide this matter.

THE "BOLD ASSUMPTION."—In the Advent Harbinger of July 16, Br. Marsh republishes our remarks, contained in the last Examiner, on Dr. Thomas' "bold assumption," and thinks "Br. Storrs has misapprehended the real sentiment conveyed in the *short* extract which he made from the brief report of Dr. Thomas' discourse", &c. Br. Marsh *charitably* believes Dr. Thomas did not mean to convey the *sentiment* we attributed to him; and he tries to convince us that we take a wrong view of the *grammatical* construction of the paragraph we quoted. Br. Marsh's effort is creditable to his heart, as he wishes to shield Dr. T. from the imputation of preaching "*another gospel*" from that which Paul preached; but, we must say, in our judgment, no other *grammatical* construction can be put upon the words than the one we put on them: nor do we believe that Dr. Thomas will thank Br. M. for his attempt to make those words mean something else than what they clearly express. That he did *intend* to say, that "*Baptism is the law of justification*" Dr. T. will *not deny*, we are sure. Br. Marsh may deny it for him; but that avails nothing. We shall see if Dr. T. backs him up in that denial. If he does so, frankly, then we will confess we misapprehend his *meaning*—not his words as reported. Till his denial appears the charge we made of a "*bold assumption*" by him, and our new charge of preaching "*another*

gospel" from Paul, will stand as our distinct utterance of what we believe is true.

Nor is this the only "*test*" which has come from the same quarter which we regard as a *self*-proclamation of *infallibility*. In the Harbinger of July 9th, Dr. T. says, his book—"*Elpis Israel*, should be in the hands of every one desirous of understanding the glad tidings of the Kingdom of God, which is *indispensable* to all who would attain to it."

Now the construction we put upon this language is this, *viz:* "An *understanding* of the glad tidings of the Kingdom of God *as I* understand that subject is *indispensable* to attain that kingdom; hence you ought to have *my* Elpis Israel." Now, will Dr. T. say that is not what he means? If it is not, we should rejoice to hear him say so *unequivocally*. The question is not now how much truth there may be in the work spoken of, but we do not believe any *mortal* has a right, or any authority, to make his particular theory a *test* of another's fitness for the kingdom of God. "There is *one* lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy; *who* art thou that judgest another?" James 4: 12. By disregarding this authoritative inquiry, men set themselves up as infallible judges in matters of faith, knowledge, and practice. This spirit brought on the great apostacy called papacy, and still continues to show itself in all persons who attempt to impose their theory *as a test* upon their fellow Christians. We blame no man for thinking his theological views are important and highly beneficial; but when any man steps beyond, and affirms *his peculiar* views and practices, in matters of religion, are "*indispensable*" for all other men, in order to a part in the kingdom of God, his words are of no weight with us; because, his *positiveness* is *prima facie* evidence that, however good his heart may be, he is laboring under a hallucination, induced by a too exclusive contemplation of *one* subject, which unfits him to judge in the case. The denunciations of such persons, if they were issued with all the thunders that ever proceeded from the seven hills of Rome, would have no effect upon our mind in the way of conviction that their position is a true one, but rather the reverse.

THE JUDGMENT.

BY THE EDITOR.

[Continued from page 103.]

We now come to the question, *Is the Judgment at the end of the world*—end of the *age*—or *at the resurrection*—the INVESTIGATING *judgment*, or *the* EXECUTIVE *one?*

This question is an important and interesting one; involving much more than may at first appear; we must therefore examine it with care, and see that we do not come to hasty conclusions. If it should prove to be the investigating judgment, we are thrown back on the difficulties before suggested. On the other hand, if it be found to be the executive judgment, we shall inquire at what period or time does the judgment of investigation take place? which will open a field for many solemn and heart-searching thoughts.

1. IS THE JUDGMENT AT THE RESURRECTION THE EXECUTIVE ONE?

With present light, we are inclined to the opinion that it is, and that the investigating judgment terminates before the executive one commences, so far as relates to all men who are the subjects of this executive judgment.

1. *Christ is specially the executive Judge.* In this respect "the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, * * * and hath given him authority to *execute* judgment." John v.

2. *The judgment at the resurrection is by Christ.* The examination of a few texts will show us that it is clearly an *executive* one: or if an investigating one at all, it is but faintly expressed, and is *inferred* rather than clearly affirmed.

1. "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his holy angels: and *then* he shall *reward* every man according to his works." Matt. 16: 27.

No other idea of judgment is *expressed* here than that of an executive one. We do not affirm, no other is implied: but the simple expression is that of execution.

2. That which seems more to express an investigating judgment is Matthew 25: 31. But if that portion of Scripture is carefully examined, we shall perhaps, see little cause to conclude it is an account of anything more than an executive judgment. Christ, on the throne of his glory, proceeds at once to "*separate* one from another," the whole account of which is embraced in two verses, 32, 33; and then he proceeds directly to the *executive* judgment, commencing with the righteous, v. 34. The whole is, apparently, a proclamation of the result of a previous investigation, the sentence, or judgment of which is now to be *executed;* the whole transaction seemingly occupying no very protracted period.

3. "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may *receive* the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. 5: 10.

Here is a clear statement of what men are to stand before Christ for. It is to *receive* the reward of their deeds: in other words, that the "judgment written" may be *executed* upon them. There is certainly no clear announcement that an *investigating* judgment *then* takes place.

5. Rev. 20: 11, 15, next demands our attention, as clearly affirming an *investigating* judgment at the last day, if any text in the Bible does. If that does not, it will be difficult to find one that does. At first view, and coming to it with the prejudices of our entire religious education, this text seems to teach that there is an *investigation* at that time, as well as an *execution*. But a close examination may serve to lessen our confidence in the idea of an investigating judgment on the occasion. Mark: "The dead, small and great"—the lowly and the illustrious—"stand before God; and the books were

opened." The language "books" is of course figurative. But what books are they? Not *blank* ones, now to be filled up, for they are already "*written*," or filled up; which was the case at the time they were *opened:* so that the writing must have been done prior to that time. The natural conclusion is, they are books of *record*, and had been filled up with *testimony* given at some previous period. When there is a court of investigation, in order to a decision, the testimony is written down or recorded. At the *opening* of such court or seat of justice, no books of recorded testimony, relating to the individual to be tried, are *opened*. The books of law may then be opened, but it is manifest in Rev. 20: 12, that if the book of law was included, the books of testimony are especially noted: for "the dead were judged out of"—*ek*—or, on account of—"those things written in the books;" which judgment is expressly said to be "*according* to their works," or according to that testimony "written in the books;" and the language repeated in verse 13, "they were judged every man according to their works," carries the idea, in connection with the context, that this judgment was an executive judgment: that is, it was the time in which, and transaction by which, the "judgment *written*" was *executed;* for, "whosoever was *not found written* in the book of life, was cast into the lake of fire." So then some names were written in the book of life when "the books" were opened; others were not found there; which seems conclusive evidence that the judgment of investigation—or receiving testimony for and against, and deciding what should be the reward of every man—was a previous transaction; and the assembling now before God is in order to the *execution*, or to inflict the punishment and bestow the reward as found written in the books.

It cannot be denied, we think, but that those whose names were found written in the book of life, at the very time the books were opened, must have been judged at some period previously, and their case determined, else their names had not been found there on opening the books, and if they had previously been judged and acquitted, so it is reasonable to suppose the others had been judged and condemned. Thus it would seem the judgment (Rev. 20: 12) is not the investigating judgment, but the executive one, or the one of *execution*. The several texts now examined may be enlarged upon at another time, and others of like character considered.

If the judgment, at the resurrection, or at the last day, is executive, and not the judgment of investigation, *when* and *where* is the INVESTIGATING judgment?—and on what *principles* is it conducted?

This is a solemn inquiry; and may the Father of light shed His divine rays of truth on our minds, that we may so be led into an understanding of His word that we may be sanctified through the truth, and be able to spread truth in the path of our fellow-men, that they may see how holy it becomes us all to live, whose every word, every work, and "every secret thing" is to come into judgment, or be *investigated* before God, or pass in His view for His decision or judgment upon it.

In answer to the first part of the question before us, one word—though not exactly scriptural in its *form*, yet expressing truth, and universally employed in theology—expresses the fact we wish to develop: that word is "*Probation*." The very idea of the word is *trial—examination*—any *proceeding designed to ascertain truth*. Webster says: "in *general*, trial for proof, or satisfactory evidence, or the time of trial."

In this definition the idea is fully brought out, on which we wish to fix attention, viz: As all theologians maintain this present life, or a man's lifetime, is his time of probation, then he is *now on trial*, or the *investigating* judgment is in actual session at this moment, and every individual during his life, is on trial before God the righteous "Judge of all the earth;" and each one is, day by day, not only at the bar of the investigating judgment, but is himself the *witness* for or against himself, and is every hour giving *testimony* on which the judge decides the case. Solemn thought! And here let it be remembered, that "God will bring every work into judgment, with every *secret thing*, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." How solemn the consideration, that each one of us, is, every hour, testifying before Jehovah's court for or against ourselves! Every word we utter is a part of our testimony; every act of our lives is but our own testimony in our case; every temper of mind indulged or cultivated, goes to make up the chain of testimony; and all our *motives* in life are so many links in the chain. What a life are we then living! Always in court—always on trial—always giving evidence by which the Judge is to decide our doom! Here is a practical influence flowing out from this view of the subject. Men cannot say "judgment will never begin," as most in fact do on the popular theory. No, they are now in the "judgment of this world"—they are now arraigned at Jehovah's bar, and this judgment has proceeded so far, and so much testimony has already been elicited, that every impenitent unbeliever "*is condemned already*"—is this moment under *sentence of death*, and the day of *executive* judgment is hastening on, though the judge offers to all men a free pardon through Jesus Christ, if they will accept it before the day, the great day, of executive judgment arrives. He is long-suffering in the *execution* of the sentence. If men abuse and slight the forbearance of the Lord, the justice of their execution will be more apparent and their guilt terribly increased.

The matter stands thus. Men are now passing through the investigating judgment; and for their sins, on their own testimony—out of their own mouths, and by their lives—they are now condemned to death, and the day of executive judgment approacheth. During the interval, God promises to blot out the sins of those who, with a broken heart for sin, and true faith in, or reliance upon his mercy in Christ, seek to him *for pardon;* and he has promised to such *life—eternal life*. Those who embrace this gracious offer are actually *pardoned*—the sentence of the investigating judgment is revoked—their sins are remembered no more: and enduring in allegiance to God to the end of their trial the testimony is in favor of their *acquittal;* and when the Executive Judge, viz. Jesus Christ, comes to "*execute* judgment upon all," those "in Christ" are first acquitted by him. This is the *first* act of executive judgment: "the dead in Christ rise," not to be *examined* to see if they may live, or to have their sins, which have been blotted out, exposed to the gaze of men and angels! No. They rise to life—*eternal life—to immortality*. Such is "the judgment of the great day" with respect to them.

On the other hand, Christ executes the judgment

of death—perdition—"*everlasting destruction*" on them that know not God *and* obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ"—which was the Gospel of *life eternal* in the kingdom of God.

"Because *sentence* against an evil work was not *speedily executed*, therefore the hearts of the sons of men were fully set in them to do evil." It seems Solomon understood the "sentence" had passed on evil doers; and yet wicked men took advantage of the delay in its execution to persist in sin. Could evil-doers have been persuaded that the *sentence itself* was still in the uncertain future, they might have persuaded themselves that somehow they would altogether escape that also, as multitudes do now. Let them know they are now passing through the judicial trial, and that their own testimony of themselves is such that the judge has *already* pronounced the *death sentence* upon them, and their only hope is to fly at once to him, while He holds out the sceptre of mercy by Christ, and seek earnestly, through God's beloved Son, *pardon*, not delaying till the day of execution; for then no pardons will be granted. But while the day of execution is *unknown*, let the *condemned* seek God's mercy, through the true Advocate, and pardon is certain: and enduring steadfast in obedience thereafter to God, eternal life will be given.

———o———

FROM C. M. RICHMOND.

Peru, Ind., July 6, 1853.

BRO. STORRS:—Your letter, and also 2 dozen "Bible vs. Tradition," came duly to hand. I have already sold eight copies, and cannot fail to sell them all soon. During the past month I have labored in Chili, Sante Fe, Logansport, and Wayne Township, Fulton County. My congregations are sometimes quite large, amounting to several hundreds, and always very attentive and interested to hear on the subject of man's character and destiny. Our Orthodox friends generally think it the best policy to *keep still*, and let the excitement die away by letting it alone. But this will not work, for the people *will hear and investigate*, and so we are often met by the defenders of Immortalism, and in some instances challenged to a discussion. The truth is, *Natural Immortality* and *Unending Torture*, are doomed errors, and in my opinion must soon come to an end.

It is a significant fact, that those who embrace the Life and Death truth in this section, are among the most intelligent and devoted of Christians. I am assisted in my labors by brother H. H. Hall, whose whole soul is bound up in the truth, and who regards himself as consecrated to its advancement.

Yours affectionately, C. M. RICHMOND.

Since the foregoing was put into the hands of the printer, the following additional letter has come to hand from Bro. Richmond, and makes us cry out—Lord, send forth more laborers into the whitening fields! There is no time to sleep on the *Life Theme*.

PERU, July 16, 1853.

BRO. STORRS:—I have just received a letter from Lafayette, a large and flourishing town about fifty or sixty miles from here, urging me to come and preach to them the words of eternal life. Your readers will be glad to know that the truth is taking root and springing up in that important town. The following is an extract from their letter:

"There are at present twenty or more of us in "this place, and we frequently meet for conversa- "tion on these important subjects. But as yet we "are a scattered band—sheep without a shepherd— "and some of us have already experienced the hand "of persecution raised against us, (by those whom "we have hitherto esteemed as brethren,) on ac- "count of our religious faith. You can help us, "my dear brother, and we hope you will do so by "your presence, as soon as possible. There is a "large field here for usefulness, and many are al- "most, if not altogether, persuaded of the Bible "truths we hold."

I intend to visit the brethren in Lafayette in about three weeks and stay over two Sabbaths. Truly the harvest is great. Oh! that there were a thousand times more laborers to go forth "*and gather fruit unto eternal life.*" In some parts of the field I am occupying, the battle begins to kindle up in earnest. In spite of the cry of "skepticism," and all the prejudices that orthodox leaders are striving to wake up against us, the people will hear and investigate the great subject of Eternal Life only in Christ. Now is the time to push forward the work of emancipating men from the thraldom of error. The work is glorious, and the reward will be glorious. Let every brother ask himself, "*Am I doing what I can? Am I practically consecrated to God, in advancing the truth and saving perishing men?* Publications should be scattered broadcast through the length and breadth of this great West. Nor shall we labor in vain. The "*good ground*" is here, if anywhere in the wide world; and we may expect "*thirty, sixty*, and an *hundred fold.*" But we must make sacrifices, dear brethren, or the work will not be done. Are we ready to do it? Yes, "*Eternal life only in Christ*," is the great *centre truth* of Christianity; if this is concealed—covered up by the traditions of men—the entire system is shorn of its glory. But let this glorious, Christ-honoring truth be held up in its Bible prominence, and Christianity is harmonious and glorious in all its parts. Then does she shine forth "fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners." Yes, if we wish to deal effectual blows at the root of all error in Catholic or Protestant churches, we shall accomplish it best by showing that *natural immortality* is no where taught in the Bible, and is therefore a gross and ruinous error. Your brother,

C. M. RICHMOND.

———o———

FROM OUR AGED BRO. WILSON.

DEAR BRO. STORRS:—I am now at South Bend, Indiana, in the region where there is much anxiety for a visit from you. I hope you will not fail them. I am well, but worn down by my extensive labors in this region of country. I left my home in Chatauque Co., N. Y., on the 20th of April last—travelled to Northeast, Pennsylvania. My horse became so frightened at the cars I could not safely drive him,

so I left him and took the cars myself. Since that time I have traveled, visited, and preached in four States, namely, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, and Indiana. The heat has been excessive, up to 104 degrees in the shade. I have preached at South Bend, Middlebury, Plymouth, Union, and Johnson; all these in Indiana, besides what I preached in Ohio when coming here. I have found good brethren in all these places, and a hearing ear, with a search of the Bible to see if these things are so. The time has been, since my remembrance, that Infidelity would hide its head from public view, but now it stalks our streets at noon-day: but now can arrest the Bible, and for trial summons a jury whose feelings would agree well with the names of the jury that tried Bunyan's Christian in the Pilgrim's Progress. We are truly fallen on perilous times: but none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear to myself, that I may finish my course with joy and not with grief. I am glad that the effect of old age, even of 77 years, is not a crime; although I find it very inconvenient for my pilgrim visits through this extended region of country, where the breadstuff for the body is far more plenty than the bread of life for the mind. I very much regret that you could not come out here, when you talked of it; then I should have seen you, but now it is very uncertain if I ever see you again—for I am like a silk worm in the last stages of life, beginning to wind up my ball, and cease to be until the resurrection of the just. I close by subscribing myself your unworthy brother in the Lord—wishing you grace, mercy, and peace, until the King comes,

JONATHAN WILSON, A Pilgrim.

SOUTH BEND, July 6th, 1853.

—o—

THE EDITOR'S TOUR WEST.—The providence of God permitting, we shall leave home for the West, the last week in this month, (August.) Our first appointment is at Buchanan, Berrien Co., Mich., commencing the last Friday eve in August, and to continue till Tuesday eve following. Next, to South Bend, St. Joseph's Co., Ind., commencing Wednesday eve, August 31st, to continue till Wednesday or Thursday, Sept. 7th or 8th. Last, to Middlebury, Elkhart Co., Ind., commencing Friday, Sept. 9th, and continue over the Sunday following.

On our way West, we will preach at Detroit, Mich., Thursday evening, August 25th, if we receive notice from friends there ten days before leaving home. We may also, on our return, spend one evening at Adrian, Mich., but can promise nothing certain as to that now.

The Examiner for September will be issued before we leave on this tour, and hence may be looked for about the 22d of August. Those who will be likely to want books and pamphlets before our return from the West, will do well to send for them before we leave, as there may be a delay if sent for in our absence: we shall, however, make the best arrangement we can to prevent delays. Brethren, pray that our Western visit may be made a blessing to ourself and others.

THE PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE acknowledge the following sums received into the *treasury* since the last Examiner was issued:

From a friend in Pownal, Vt., by M. Batchelor, - - - - - -	$ 5 00
From a friend in Worcester, Mass.,	5 00
From friends in the State of Indiana, by C. M. Richmond, - - - -	12 65
From a friend in Bergen, N. J., -	5 00
From a friend in Marblehead, Mass.	1 00

—o—

BIBLE VS. TRADITION.—The first edition of one thousand copies of this work has been scattered, and we have just issued a *second* edition. We believe we have *refunded* to those who pledged to help publish the first edition, the amount, in books, they have paid, where it has been desired. If any have been overlooked, we will satisfy them if they will give us notice. The work has been well received and is doing immense good, we have reason to think from what we hear. Let it still be scattered. For $1, sent us free of postage, we will return one copy of the work, and the two double Examiners containing Ham's views "*On Man in Death*," and "*Life and Death*," postage paid; or we will send Bible vs. Tradition, and the *entire* volume of the Examiner for 1852, which contains the double numbers. In this case the postage must be paid by the purchaser.

—o—

WHEN SATISFIED?

"I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." Ps. 17 : 15.

Not *satisfied*, while thus away from home;
Not *satisfied* on this sin-blighted sphere,
For though surrounded, we are sad and lone,
Where prospects fade, and greenest leaves turn sear.

Not *satisfied*; if God fills not the heart;
We find in all earth's joys no charm to bless—
Until bestowed on us the immortal part,
There is a void lies deep in its recess.

Not *satisfied* with thy false glare, O earth,
A sparkling meteor that will lead astray—
Just so its seeming happiness and mirth
Leaves us in darkness all our little day.

Woe-planted soil! O, how cans't thou bestow
The gifts to *satisfy*, for which we crave?
Those fruits that in a purer clime must grow,
Live near the throne, and the life's river wave.

O, no! not *satisfied* 'till we awake—
Rise from the bosom of our parent earth,
And paradisaical robes again we take—
Assume the new, the resurrection birth.

The earnest *now* we have of life to come;
We *reap* when Christ will raise the sleeping dead,
And ransomed ones shall then be welcomed home,
Where suns ne'er set, and vanquished death has sped.

GEO. MAGETE.

BIB
NO IMMORTA
VOL. VIII.
GEORGE STORRS
PUBLISE
At No. 140 Fu
TERMS.—Single
copies, $5; thirtee
advance.

ORTHODOXY
BY WM. GLEN

"How loud, how
sounds sent forth by t
does LIFE, at his biddi
securest holds of deatl
beaming with beauty,
desolation."—DR. JOH
Life."

In a previous artic
we endeavored to ur
Saviour is the appoin
in opposition to the
already by creation p
tality. We ventured
theology which repre
happiness, and not of
represent the design
fact must be pressed
that the multitude who
may be compelled to
begin with contrite h
suitable manner. Wh
hibiting him as less th
convinced that among
up to the extent of
with love and honor,
gladly hail a clear sta
tions and prerogatives.
companies, and creeds
the dread of worldly l
aside from the scriptu
but all are not so en
These powerful influe
ignored by us. Who
when he is sorely tem
unresistingly to suffer
feet with cords and wi
ancipator, and hence w
and love.

We accuse our frien
tially setting aside the
mon Saviour is the life
most literal sense of t
ing accusation," since
and with a true desire
ness from our views, as
them a happiness in t
"substantially" do wha
we allow in the title of

OMMITTEE acknowledge
ived into the *treasury*
as issued:

nal, Vt., by M.	
- - -	$ 5 00
rcester, Mass.,	5 00
ate of Indiana,	
- - -	12 65
, N. J., -	5 00
ehead, Mass.	1 00

The first edition of one
ork has been scattered,
a *second* edition. We
to those who pledged
edition, the amount, in
ere it has been desired.
ed, we will satisfy them
The work has been
immense good, we have
we hear. Let it still be
free of postage, we will
rk, and the two double
n's views "*On Man in Death*," postage paid; or
radition, and the *entire*
for 1852, which contains
is case the postage must

TISFIED?

with thy likeness." Ps. 17 : 15.

away from home;
in-blighted sphere,
we are sad and lone,
and greenest leaves turn

s not the heart;
joys no charm to bless—
immortal part,
p in its recess.

lse glare, O earth,
at will lead astray—
iness and mirth
all our little day.

w cans't thou bestow
r which we crave?
rer clime must grow,
and the life's river wave.

we awake—
f our parent earth,
gain we take—
esurrection birth.

e of life to come;
t will raise the sleeping

ll then be welcomed home,
, and vanquished death
GEO. MAGETE.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VIII. NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER, 1853. NO. 9.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 140 Fulton-street, (Up Stairs.)

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

ORTHODOXY PARTIALLY RIGHT.

BY WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, SCOTLAND.

"How loud, how deep, how piercing, are the sounds sent forth by the archangel's trumpet! How does LIFE, at his bidding, find its way to the deepest, securest holds of death; and how do countless forms, beaming with beauty, come forth from the abodes of desolation."—DR. JOHN BROWN'S "Resurrection of Life."

In a previous article, entitled "Jesus the Life," we endeavored to unfold the doctrine that the Saviour is the appointed eternalizer of his servants, in opposition to the common idea that they are already by creation partakers of a common immortality. We ventured to suggest that the prevailing theology which represents him as the bringer of happiness, and not of endless being, does sadly misrepresent the design of his mission. This painful fact must be pressed distinctly and high into view, that the multitude who unintentionally limit his glory may be compelled to acknowledge its truth, and begin with contrite hearts to exalt him in a more suitable manner. What interest have they in exhibiting him as less than he is? None; and we are convinced that among those who bear his name, and up to the extent of their knowledge mention it with love and honor, there are many who would gladly hail a clear statement of his sublime functions and prerogatives. The influence of names, and companies, and creeds—the terror of reproach, and the dread of worldly loss, may induce many to turn aside from the scriptural facts we are proclaiming, but all are not so enthralled, so weak, so selfish. These powerful influences are neither slighted nor ignored by us. Who would not feel for a neighbor when he is sorely tempted; yea, when he is seen unresistingly to suffer himself to be tied hands and feet with cords and withes. Truth is the great emancipator, and hence we must speak it with fulness and love.

We accuse our friends and brethren of substantially setting aside the sublime fact that our common Saviour is the life-giver to his friends, in the most literal sense of these terms. This is no "railing accusation," since we present it in kindness, and with a true desire to share with them a happiness from our views, as undeniably we divide with them a happiness in theirs. In our opinion they "substantially" do what we affirm of them; yet as we allow in the title of this paper, they are "partially right." The language in our motto is just such as we would employ; and yet, after all, it may be understood to express more than its distinguished author would consent to. Indeed, we feel sure, that were he questioned as to the meaning of his lines, it would come out that they imported much less than a reader of them, by themselves, might suppose. Such language is common in the lips of popular theologians and Christians; and though it is scriptural, it does not, when employed by them, embody the idea that is lodged in it by the sacred penmen. Be plainer, so one whispers: and we shall. According to the common notion, the souls of believers are at death made perfect in glory, and their bodies being united still to Christ, tarry in their graves till the resurrection. Some may prefer to have the word "spirits" instead of "souls;" at present they may be taken as identical, and of course as being what they are generally understood to designate. The soul of the believer being in fact the man himself,—since as we often hear the *soul* and not the body is the man,—is incapable of death, and of course had no necessity to exercise dependence on Jesus for life. If the language "immortal soul" means anything, it signifies that it—more correctly each human being—must have lived for ever, even if the Lord Jesus had not appeared in this world. The body may require life from him; all that the soul needs is happiness, and if God judges proper, reunion with a material frame. Man then essentially and substantially requires no gift of life—no resurrection—no revival from complete desolation. Life he never lost; life he does not need to have restored. He is beyond the dominion of the King of Terrors, and requires no deliverance from his sway. As has been orthodoxically said by Addison,—

> "The soul, secured in her existence, smiles
> At the drawn dagger, and defies its point.
> The stars shall fade away, the sun himself
> Grow dim with age, and nature sing in years,
> But thou shalt flourish in immortal youth,
> Unhurt amidst the war of elements,
> The wreck of matter, and the crush of worlds."

It is long since the Apostle John, for example, died. But when he expired the dissolution of the saint was seeming, not a reality. He die! The idea is scouted by the generality of Christians. At this moment he is viewed in the blaze of heaven, having a crown of fine gold on his head, and his eye kindling with unutterable exstasy. What life—we don't mean happiness—has he found from Jesus? Why, is it not admitted that had Christ Jesus failed to redeem the world, that at this hour John would have been as really alive, though of course dwelling in a very different portion of the universe? Life! What life does he need? His body requires to be re-built and re-animated by the power of Jesus. His body! and that is confessedly not himself; it is only life to a body that he requires from the Redeemer—a body in which *he* will dwell—

a body without which, as representations go, he is very blessed and very diligent. The archangel's trumpet is to be the signal, then, of life to bodies —not to men. Partially true the common doctrine is, but how insignificant its compass compared with that of the Bible announcements? On the one hand, it tells us that men die, and not their bodies merely—"Man dieth and wasteth away"—man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou"—not a portion of him—"return;" his breath (his breath, or spirit of life) goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." On the other, and of necessity, we read that it is men who are to rise, and not a part that is to be connected with them as an appendage or organ of activity.—"Thy dead *men* shall live—I shall be satisfied when *I* awake with thy likeness—the dead in Christ shall rise first—*them* that sleep in Jesus will God bring with him—in Christ shall all be made alive, but every MAN in his own order." Assuming that the soul of man is capable of disembodied existence, and of an immortal nature, the Bible statements about death and the resurrection have been modified, and in many cases exhausted, of meaning altogether. The golden vessel is there, but the wine of truth is gone. As soon as it shall be acknowledged, and we confidently believe the day for this is coming, that the soul of a man is just the organized being himself, and that his spirit is the breath of life which is in his nostrils, and which, at his dissolution, returns to God who gave it. In a word, when it shall be confessed that man is a UNITY, the teaching in the Book on the subjects of death and resurrection will be much more easily apprehended—much more consistently explained.* It is reverence for God that keeps our friends from declaring that *entire* man needs life. Thinking that the Book announces the dogma of immortal soulism, what else could we expect them to do? They declare Jesus gives life to what needs life, and a miserable conveyance it is, since it is not life to a man, but to his future habitation, which is quickened, not so much by any actual infusion of life from Jesus, as by his conjoining to the refined corporiety the deathless soul whose presence vitalizes and warms it, like a fire in the centre of a dwelling. Jesus is the life-giver, then, as a conjoiner of soul and body, not as an infuser of vitality into a resurrected, sainted being. So worketh the heathenish doctrine of immortal-soulism; it misrepresents death's results, and the Redeemer's conquest; tempts a thinking man to believe that if all Jesus does as a life-giver, and the resurrection, is merely what orthodoxy in its blindness assigns him, there are in the Volume a great many words about a very small matter. The church of God will yet blush that this beggarly account of the Saviour's life-giving glory was ever held forth by her to the world. When Paul shall take the place of Plato, that hour will arrive.

The final era has come, and the Saviour descends to exert his power. He leaves yon fair mansions, and with him are troops of souls—things of life and things of light—needing to be incorporated, and on the eve of entering a fleshly abode! The archangel's trumpet sounds, and forms after the ancient model of humanity, though excelling in beauty and majesty, start forth from the plains of the astonished world. Each body has a soul thrust into it, as a sword is sent into its scabbard, and the animating force of the sometime exile from materialism, pervades the trunk and limbs as the electric influence diffuses itself through rocks and trees. Eternal power has labored at this humble task; and this we are taught by orthodoxy is the grand triumph of Immanuel—this is his unveiling as the Life!

Time brings on the appointed hour when the Lord Jesus shall revisit this weary world. He comes attended with squadrons of blessed angels, to be the ministers of his will, and the spectators of his glory. He comes with a conqueror's might to do a conqueror's work, and the grandest victory earth has ever witnessed is about to be accomplished. The pious ones who fell asleep in the ages past, are held in bondage by the arm of death. They are in the enemies' land; hushed are their voices; still their hearts; their very thoughts have long since perished. Can these DEAD MEN live? They shall. The trumpet peals through space; "life at His bidding finds its way to the deepest, securest holds of death;" and the innumerable heirs of the first resurrection have awoke—they are clad in the garments of incorruption—they are radiant with the morning flush of perennial youth. Behold the resurrection and the life illustrated and confirmed; the long standing promises literally executed, and the family of the redeemed emancipated from the noisome grave. All heaven is jubilee; the new creation, the sons of the resurrection, take their place on the angelic level, and send forth a triumphant hymn to their glorious Benefactor. "O death where is thy sting, O grave where is thy victory. Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Let it be written, remembered, and pondered, "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power."

* See the works "Soul" and "Spirit," by W. G. Moncrieff.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS.

THE MORALITY OF THE CRUCIFIXION.

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM.

(*Continued from page 116.*)

We recur, then, to our question concerning the cross. How came the cross, that instrument of ignominy and suffering, to be identified with the history of our Lord Jesus Christ? The cross was the gibbet of the ancient Gentiles, and what has a gibbet to do with the holy Son of God? He who was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners,—he who came on an embassy of eternal life from the Immortal God to mortal men, and to prepare them personally for its enjoyments,—how came it to pass that *he* should ever bend beneath the burden of his own gibbet, and be ignominiously put to death thereon? The question, familiar as it is, is not without novelty, and it is moreover fraught with the most serious and sacred interest. It is not a question of mere theoretic theology, but of practical morals and personal salvation. As a question of history we are referred to the records of the Evangelists.

The death of Christ is uniformly represented in

the Scriptures as the most stupendous act of human wickedness, and as originating in the instigation of the arch-spirit of evil,—the Devil. The impiety of the Jews culminated in the dreadful act of putting the Son of God to death, although even this sin God was prepared to forgive them, if they would afterwards repent and believe in him whom they had so impiously rejected. The presence of Satanic agency in the rejection and crucifixion of Christ is most distinctly recognized; and the whole proceeding, according to the sacred narrative, was diabolic and wicked in the extreme. On this Scriptural view of the death of the Lord Jesus we are desirous of fixing the reader's attention, as a necessary preliminary to the scriptural arguments which we design to erect on it. Notwithstanding he may be fully persuaded of the truth of this statement, we invite him to look in detail at the evidence of its truth, as it will better prepare him to estimate the worth of the important conclusions at which we shall arrive.

And, first, as to the part which Satan had in putting the Lord Jesus to death. After the success of his temptation in Eden, Satan is thus addressed by Jehovah: "I will put enmity . . . . . between thy seed and her seed; it [he, *viz.*, Christ] shall bruise thy head [inflict a mortal wound], and *thou shalt bruise his heel*,"—inflict a temporary and reparable injury,—that is, cause Christ's death. Now, let it be observed how all the historic facts of the case unite to establish this important fact, that Satan was the great instigator and ultimate cause of the death of Christ. When Christ had chosen his twelve disciples, he thus addressed them: "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a *devil*?" John vi. 70. Judas was thus referred to as the voluntary agent of the Devil in the betrayal of his master. When the moment of the betrayal was near at hand, and the purpose was fully formed, we are told that, "Supper being ended, *the Devil* having put it into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him," Jesus, "when he had dipped the sop, gave it to Judas . . . . . and after the sop *Satan* entered into him." John xiii, 2, 27. As the moment of the betrayal drew on, and the preparations for its accomplishment were being made, Jesus said to his disciples: "*The Prince of this world* cometh and hath nothing in me." John xiv. 30. And when the actual arrest took place, and the person of the Redeemer, under the guidance of Judas, was seized, addressing "the Chief Priests, and captains of the Temple, and the elders which were come to him," Jesus said, "This is your hour, and *the Power of darkness*." Luke xxii. 53. Thus is it apparent, on the testimony of our Lord himself, that at every important step of the progress of this unparalleled crime, *Satan* is recognized as the active instigatory agent. The betrayal and crucifixion of Christ was therefore, in the most emphatic sense, *diabolical;* and in the sight of God was the highest possible expression of human wickedness.

The historic narrative of events subsequent to the betrayal and arrest of Christ unite to show that this great tragedy exhibits the consummation of human guilt, and placed all who had anything to do with it in the position of criminals deserving the severest marks of the Divine displeasure.

Jesus was conveyed into the palace of the Roman Pilate, and arraigned at the bar of a Roman Court of Justice. At this moment the wife of the Procurator Pilate sends an urgent message to her husband. "Have thou nothing to do," she says, "with that *just person*, for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him." Seeing that he could not resist the clamor of the infuriated people, Pilate, who had labored hard to release Christ, called for water, according to the custom of the times, and washing his hands as an act of solemn abjuration, exclaimed in the presence of them all, "*I* am innocent of the blood of this *just person*" "*I* find in him no fault at all." Previous to this disclaimer of Pilate of any participation in the national guilt of putting Christ to death, Judas the traitor had gone to the Chief Priests in the vain hope of recovering the victim of his avarice, and finding that his bargain of blood could not be revoked, he threw down the bribe, exclaiming, "I have betrayed the *innocent blood*," and, tormented with remorse and despair, he went and hanged himself. The officer of the guard in charge of the execution of Christ, and also they that were with him, shocked at this act of popular outrage, exclaimed; "Truly this was a righteous man!" "Truly this was the Son of God!" Here is the testimony of all the principals concerned in the death of Christ, and that testimony is *to the innocence of Jesus, his unmerited condemnation, and their own guilt.*

The view taken by our Lord himself of this awful transaction exhibits it in the same sinful light. He foretold it to his disciples as an act of basest ingratitude,—as a betrayal. In such solemn and condemnatory terms does he remark upon both his betrayal and the betrayer,—"The Son of man goeth as it is written of him: but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! It had been good for that man if he had not been born." How emphatically does he express the moral character of this last tragedy of his life, when arousing his disciples from their sleep in Gethsemane he exclaimed, "The hour is come; behold, the Son of man *is betrayed into the hands of sinners*." Need we remind the reader of that wonderful scene on Olivet, when Jesus saw the city and wept over it? Were not those tears wept because of the high hand Jerusalem, the holy city, was about to lift up against God and his Christ? "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, *thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee*, how often would I have gathered you together as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not." What can be more decisive of the morality of Christ's capture and crucifixion than his own declaration to Pilate. "He that delivered me to thee hath *the greater sin*." The whole proceeding was one of high criminality before God, and all who had aught to do with it were chargeable with less or "greater *sin*." The merciful and meek sufferer knew the nature of his murderers' crime,—how highly offensive it was to the "righteous Father;" hence he prayed for their forgiveness,—"Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

And can we fail to interpret the expressive utterance of the Divine feeling on this guilty occasion, when there spread over the land a preternatural darkness from the sixth to the ninth hour, when the earth heaved with terrific violence, riving asunder rocks, and exposing the sleeping-places of the dead? Was not this expressive, in part at least, of the dis-

pleasure of the Great Looker-on, that the race whom he mercifully designed to ransom by the medial agency of his well-beloved Son should cast out that beloved Son and destroy him? Whether or not we interpret aright this preternatural circumstance, none will doubt that God was highly displeased that he should, in the person of his Son, come unto his own, and his own should not receive him. In the view of the parable of the wicked husbandmen, which sets forth the morality of our Lord's treatment, and the estimation in which God, as the lord of the vineyard, regarded his Son's rejection, it will not be doubted that the crucifixion of Christ, so far from being acceptable to God, or demanded by any principle of his perfect moral government, was altogether a guilty violation of his holy will, and a daring defiance of his law and authority. Otherwise, what meant our Lord when he asked his auditors, "When the Lord of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen?" Did he not extort the true judgment from the lips of the men who were about to enact the part of those very "husbandmen," when they say unto him, "*He will miserably destroy those wicked men*, and will let out his vineyard to other husbandmen"? "*Therefore*," he replied—"*therefore* (that is, *because* you are about to cast the Son of God out of the vineyard and slay him,) the kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof,"—a judgment which was fearfully fulfilled in their final national overthrow and dispersion among the nations of the world.

We have detailed the several historic facts setting forth the real moral character of the crucifixion of Christ. We have seen the judgment of Christ as to the morality of this national act of the Jewish people; and we have further seen that God himself concurs in the general condemnation of this tragic act as a high misdemeanor against truth, and justice, and his own high authority. We may expect then that our Lord's Apostles would in their public preaching, exhibit the national rejection of Christ in the same moral light, as a great sin to be repented of, and needing the pardon of God. Let the following discourses of the Apostles suffice to show the views they entertain of the crucifixion of their Master. On the occasions of their first public addresses, the Apostles accuse their countrymen of a most foul murder. "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, *ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain*." "*Ye denied the Holy one and the Just*, and desired a murderer to be granted you, *and killed the Prince of Life*. . . . "And now, brethren," says Peter, "I wot that *through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers*." The Apostles are careful to assure their hearers that they had not taken God by surprise, or thwarted his plans, for that he had *foreseen* that such a treatment his beloved Son would receive at their hands. They make, too, all the allowance that charity can permit in the awful part taken both by the people and their rulers in this tragic affair; but they never allude to the crucifixion of Christ as being designed *to satisfy any judicial demands* of the law of God, or to secure the moral efficiency of the Divine government. They speak only of it, as of a murder most foul; as a wicked defiance of all law and order, human and divine; and call upon the perpetrators and connivers at this great wickedness to seek the forgiveness of their crime in shedding the blood of God's holy and well-beloved Son. "Repent," is their earnest exhortation. "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted," for this Jesus whom ye have rejected by crucifying him, is that prophet concerning whom "Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me, him shall ye hear in all things, whatsoever he shall say unto you."

Here, then, are gathered together, the plain, unvarnished facts, in reference to that great historic fact, the crucifixion of our Lord Jesus Christ; and here are the commentaries, so to speak, of God, of Christ, and of the first Christian preachers, on that fact. Now, we appeal to the calm, enlightened intelligence—we appeal to the most reverential feelings of our readers—and ask, Does the Scriptural exhibition of the crucifixion of Christ give any countenance to the popular apprehension of its spiritual import, which it is maintained is the true meaning of the Christian Atonement? Does it harmonize with the history which we have been briefly reviewing, that the crucifixion of our Lord was demanded for the violated honor of the Divine government? Does it, as set forth in the New Testament, look like a fact that was necessary to restore moral harmony between God and his rebellious creatures? It is so represented in the scheme of popular Christianity. Mark, reader, the wide divarication between the sacred record and the modern ascendant creed. The former, as we have seen, proclaims the crucifixion to be a *crime*, needing to be mourned over and repented of—the latter declares it to be the very apex of *judicial equity*. The former pronounces a series of *condemnations* on it, as an act uncalled for and wicked; it was condemned by all the principals concerned therein—the betrayer, the Roman Judge and his wife, the Captain of the Roman Guard, and the spectators of the execution—it was condemned by Christ, by God, and by the Apostles: the latter pronounces an unqualified *approval* of it as an event demanded for the glory of God and the eternal good of men. The former represents it as a *violent severance of the bond* which subsisted between God and his creatures, and a *de facto* rejection of God himself; the latter represents it as the *formal cementing of a spiritual union* between mankind and their Maker. The former represents *Satan* as the ultimate author, and *wicked men* as the proximate authors of the death of Christ: the latter maintains that God *himself* was the *contriver* and *author* of this great event. The former shows that Christ was upheld and ministered to by his Heavenly Father while enduring the bitter opposition and *wrath of men:* the latter insists that Christ's death was an evidence of his Father's judicial rejection, and that he was then enduring *the infinite wrath of God.* The former shows that the crucifixion of Christ was an act most *displeasing and offensive* to God: the latter that it was designed by God himself for his own *personal satisfaction* as the Moral Governor of the world. The former asserts that the death of Christ was the crowning expression of his perfect personal *obedience* to the holy law of God, and therefore highly meritorious, and constituting him a perfect example to the world: the latter insists that the death of Christ on the cross was a *judicial punishment* which God inflicted upon him as the substitute in behalf of a guilty race. The former exhibits the

sufferings and death of Christ for the *imitation* of the Church, who are required, like their Master, to be "obedient unto death;" the latter declares that the sufferings and death of Christ *are beyond all imitation*, as not being in their nature and design exemplary, but judicial, and therefore peculiar and unique. We need not pursue further the obvious contrasts between the New Testament and the popular exhibitions of the death of Christ. The thoughtful reader will see and acknowledge that there are very great contrasts between these two candidates for the faith of mankind; and in vain will he seek to reconcile and identify them. He must accept one or the other—he cannot retain both. The Bible and the popular exhibitions of the death of Christ are widely divergent from each other: they have scarcely aught in common but the mutual recognition of the simple historic fact, that Christ suffered death on the cross.

(*To be Continued.*)

HUMAN MATERIALISM.

We continue our extracts from the "*Appendix*" of Br. Moncrieff's work on the Hebrew and Greek terms for *spirit*. Let them be read and pondered well; and may reason return to men who have so long talked about that which they understood not.

IMMATERIALITY AND IMMORTALITY.

The following extract goes on the supposition that the "soul" and "spirit" of man are identical, and that his spirit is immaterial, which we have amply shown is a baseless conceit. Letting the writer assume his own premises, letting him, in fact, assume the common theory about the human spirit, his reasoning is admirable, and displays in a telling manner, the weakness of all inferences concerning the deathlessness of man as resulting from the nature of his spirit.

"The argument from immateriality to immortality, is evidently illogical: and though it has satisfied many intelligent philosophers, ought not, we think, to satisfy, and, if understood, would not satisfy, even an intelligent flea, to say nothing of an elephant. For if men would but confine themselves to what they know, they would see that nothing is more clear than the consciousness that the origin or continued existence, whether of body or spirit, depends on no will of theirs; upon nothing less than the *fiat* of that Power that created both; and certainly none ought to have seen this more clearly than Descartes himself, who, as we have seen, makes the conservation of his immaterial self, from moment to moment, a distinct proof of the existence of the Deity. As far as we can see, therefore, material forms may, if the Divine will so should please, be immortal: and in like manner, immaterial essences, by the same *fiat* may become mortal. The utmost that the doctrine of immateriality infers is, that it exempts the soul from certain known causes of change or dissolution, but it may have a term of its own, for aught we *know*; a cause of decay peculiar to itself. The argument is about as sound as if, having ascertained that a man will not die of consumption, we were to infer that neither will he die of anything else.

We are firmly convinced of the truth of the great doctrine of the soul's immateriality and immortality. We merely deny the force of any argument from one to the other; and moreover, that the latter, apart from express revelation (where is this revelation given?) is anything more than a most precarious conclusion from guesses and presumptions. This is amply proved by the wavering tone of all reasoning and speculation among the greatest masters of both, previous to the Christian revelation; and it is at that period, and at that better than any other, that we can apply the true test of the limits of merely human speculation on the subject." *Edinburgh Review, No.* 193, *pp.* 56, 57.

MATTER CAPABLE OF THINKING.

"Your first argument I take to be this, that, according to me, the knowledge we have being by our ideas, and our idea of matter, in general, being a solid substance, and our idea of body a solid, extended, figured substance; if I admit matter to be capable of thinking, I confound the idea of matter with the idea of a spirit; to which I answer, no; no more than I confound the idea of matter with the idea of an horse, when I say that matter, in general, is a solid external substance, and that a horse is a material animal, or an extended, solid substance, with sense and spontaneous motion.

The idea of matter is an extended, solid substance; wherever there is such a substance, there is matter, and the essence of matter, whatever other qualities, not contained in that essence, it shall please God to superadd to it. For example, God creates an extended, solid substance, without the superadding anything else to it, and so we may consider it at rest: to some parts of it he superadds motion, but it has still the essence of matter: other parts of it he frames into plants, with all the excellence of vegetation, life, and beauty, which is to be found in a rose, or a peach tree, &c., above the essence of matter, in general, but it is still but matter: to other parts he adds sense and spontaneous motion, and those other properties that are to be found in an elephant. Hitherto it is not doubted, but the power of God may go, and that the properties of a rose, a peach, or an elephant, superadded to matter, change not the properties of matter; but matter is, in these things, matter still. But if one venture to go one step further, and say, God may *give to matter, thought, reason, and volition*, as well as sense and spontaneous motion, there are men ready presently to *limit* the power of the Omnipotent Creator, and tell us "he cannot do it, because it destroys the essence, or changes the essential properties of matter." To make good which assertion, they have no more to say but that thought and reason are not included in the essence of matter. I grant it; but whatever excellency, not contained in its essence, be *superadded to matter*, it does not destroy the essence of matter, if it leaves it an extended, solid substance; wherever that is, there is the essence of matter; and if everything of greater perfection, superadded to such a substance, destroys the essence of matter, what will become of the essence of matter in a plant or an animal, whose properties far exceed those of a mere extended, solid substance?

But it is farther urged, that we cannot conceive how matter can think. I grant it; but to argue from thence, that God, therefore, cannot give to matter a faculty of thinking, is to say, God's Omnipotency is limited to a narrow compass, because man's understanding is so; and brings down God's

infinite power to the size of our capacities. If God can give no power to any parts of matter but what man can account for, from the essence of matter, in general; if all such qualities and properties must destroy the essence or change the essential properties of matter, which are to our conceptions above it, and we cannot conceive to be the natural consequence of that essence; it is plain that the essence of matter is destroyed, and its essential properties changed, in most of the sensible part of this our system. For it is visible that all the planets have revolutions around certain remote centres, which I would have any one explain, or make conceivable by the bare essence, or natural powers depending on the essence of matter in general, without something added to that essence which we cannot conceive; for the moving of matter in a crooked line, or the attraction of matter by matter, is all that can be said in the case; either of which it is above our reach to derive from the essence of matter, or body in general; though one of these two must unavoidably be allowed to be superadded, in this instance, to the essence of matter in general. The Omnipotent Creator advised not with us in the making of the world, and his ways are not the less excellent because they are past our finding out.

* * * * * *

For to keep within the present subject of the power of thinking and self-motion, bestowed by Omnipotent power on some part of the matter; the objection to this is, I cannot conceive how matter should think. What is the consequence? ergo, (therefore,) God cannot give it a power to think. Let this stand for a good reason, and then proceed in other cases by the same. You cannot conceive how matter can attract matter, at any distance, much less at the distance of 1,000,000 miles; ergo, God cannot give it such a power! &c.

* * * * * * *

Though to me sensation be comprehended under thinking in general, yet in the foregoing discourse, I have spoken of sense in brutes, as distinct from thinking, because your Lordship, as I remember, speaks of sense in brutes. But here I take liberty to observe, that if your Lordship allows brutes to have sensation, it will follow, either that God can, and doth, give to *some parcels of matter a power of perception and thinking*, or that all animals have immaterial, and consequently, according to your Lordship, immortal souls, as well as men, and to say that fleas, mites, &c., have immortal souls, as well as men, will possibly be looked on as going a great way to serve an hypothesis, and it would not very well agree with what your Lordship says, Ans. 2, p. 64."—*Locke to the Bishop of Worcester; Works Fol. Ed.* 1740, *Vol. I., pp.* 588, 589, 590-592.

———o———

PRES. EDWARDS ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

NOTES BY REV. J. PANTON HAM, ENGLAND.

President Edwards, a most impressive preacher of the popular theory of future punishmennt, thus describes the portion of the wicked after this life:

"The soul of a wicked man at its departure from the body will be made immediately sensible that it is before an infinitely holy and dreadful God, and his own final Judge; and will then see how terrible a God he is, how infinitely he hates sin; he will be sensible of the greatness of God's anger against sin, and how dreadful is his displeasure. Then will he be sensible of the dreadful majesty and power of God, and how fearful a thing it is to fall into his hands. Then the soul shall come naked with all its guilt, and in all its filthiness, a vile, loathsome, abominable creature, an enemy to God, a rebel against him, with the guilt of all its rebellion and disregard of God's commands, and contempt of his authority, and slight of the glorious Gospel, before God as its judge. This will fill the soul with horror and amazement. . . . . As soon as ever the soul parts from the body, from that moment the case will be absolutely determined; there will then be an end for ever to all hope, to everything that men hang upon in this life; the soul then shall know certainly that it is to be miserable to all eternity, without any remedy. It shall see that God is its enemy; it shall see its judge clothed in his wrath and vengeance. Then its misery will begin, it will that moment be swallowed up in despair; the great gulf will be fixed between it and happiness, the door of mercy will be forever shut up, the irrevocable sentence will be passed. Then shall the wicked know what is before them. Before the soul was in distress for fear how it would be; but now, who can conceive the amazement that fills it that moment when all hope is cut off, and it knows that there never will be any difference!

"We may well suppose that when a wicked man dies, his soul is seized by wicked angels: and that they are round his bed ready to seize the miserable soul as soon as it is parted from the body. And with what fierceness and fury do those cruel spirits fly upon their prey; and the soul shall be left in their hands. There shall be no good angels to guard and defend it. God will take no care of it; there is nothing to help it against those cruel spirits that shall lay hold of it, carry it to hell, there to torment it for ever! God will leave it wholly in their hands, and will give it up to their possession when it comes to die; and it shall be carried down to hell, to the abode of devils and damned spirits. If the fear of hell on a death-bed sometimes fills the wicked with amazement, how will they be overwhelmed when they feel its torments, when they shall feel them not only as great, but far greater than their fears! They will find them far beyond what they could conceive of before they felt them; for none know the power of God's anger but they that experience it. Ps. xc. 11: 'Who knoweth the power of thine anger? even according to thy fear, so is thy wrath.'"

Surely not *such* "anger" and "wrath" as is here depicted!

"Departed spirits of wicked men," says Pres. Edwards, "are doubtless carried to some particular place in the universe, which God has prepared to be the receptacle of his wicked, rebellious, and miserable subjects: a place where God's avenging justice shall be glorified; a place built to be the prison where the devils and wicked men are reserved till the day of judgment."

Can "God's avenging justice" be "glorified" by permitting one order of his intelligent and apostate creatures to be *the prey and malignant sport* of another order of apostate beings! Our author moreover, represents the devils as *most willing and*

delighted agents in fulfilling their hellish mission as the tormentors of wicked men! So far, then, as the *devils* are concerned, hell is to their *taste*—its fiendish occupation their *delight*. For *them* hell is a heaven—a place of happiness rather than of misery! Strange theory of future punishment is this!

"Here," proceeds President Edwards, "the souls of wicked men shall suffer extreme and amazing misery in a separate state until the resurrection. This misery is not indeed their full punishment; nor is the happiness of the saints before the day of judgment, their full happiness. It is with the souls of wicked men as it is with devils. Though the devils suffer extreme torment now, yet they do not suffer their complete punishment."

What inconsistency is here? President Edwards wards represents first all the devils as the most busy and delighted agents of Divine vengeance, and then affirms that they are themselves all the while the prey of extreme torments! And with even greater than "extreme torment" in prospect after the decisions of the judgment.

"They are reserved," he proceeds, "in the state they are in; and for what are they preserved but for a greater degree of punishment? . . . . But yet they are there (in the intermediate state as separate souls and apostate demons,) in extreme and inconceivable misery; they are there deprived of all good; they have no rest nor comfort; and they are subject to the wrath of God; God there executes wrath on them without mercy, and they are swallowed up in wrath. . . . . And those who go to hell never can escape thence; there they remain imprisoned till the day of judgment, and their torments remain continually. Those wicked men who died many years ago their souls went to hell, and there they are still; those who went to hell in former ages of the world have been in hell ever since, all the while suffering torment. They have nothing else to spend their time in there, but to suffer torment; they are kept in being for no other purpose; (!) and though they have many companions in hell, yet they are no comfort to them, for there is no friend, no love, no pity, no quietness, no prospect, no hope."

Can the multitude of professing Christians really believe this doctrine, and not weep as though their "head were waters, and their eyes a fountain of tears," at the reflection that at this, and at every moment of their lives, hundreds and thousands of their fellow-creatures are actually enduring these inexpressible sufferings? Perhaps, reader, thou hast lost a beloved friend concerning whom thou hast no hope—canst thou think that such is his present awful condition, and that the following description of our sadly mistaken author, yet awaits him in the eternal future?

"The separate souls of the wicked, besides the present misery they now suffer, shall be in amazing fear of the more full punishment at the day of judgment. Though their punishment in their separate state, be exceedingly dreadful, and far more than they can bear, (!) though it be so great as to sink and crush them, yet this is not all; (!) they are reserved for *a much greater* and more *dreadful punishment* (!) at the day of judgment: their torment will then be *vastly augmented, and continue in that augmentation to all eternity* (!) Their punishment will be so much greater then, that their misery in this separate state is but an imprisonment before an execution."

We are told that the "imprisonment" is "*far more than they can bear*," and "*so great as to sink and crush them;*" how then can the wretched objects of such punishment *endure* "*a much greater and more dreadful punishment*, which is to be "*vastly augmented and continue in that augmentation to all eternity!*" Both the language and the horrid conception lose their awful gravity in this anti-climax of positive absurdity.

He proceeds: "When we are under any great pain of body at any time, how do we dread the least addition to it! its continuance is greatly dreaded, much more its increase. How much more will those separate spirits that suffer the torments of hell, dread that augmentation and completing of their torment, which there will be at the day of judgment, when what they feel already, is vastly more than they can support themselves; when they shall be, as it were, begging one drop of water to cool their tongues, when they would give ten thousand worlds for the least abatement of their misery? How sinking will it be to think, that instead of that the day is coming when God shall come forth out of heaven, to sentence them to a far more dreadful degree of misery, and to continue them under it for ever! . . . The damned in hell know not the time when the day of judgment shall be, but when the time comes it will be made known, and it will be the most dreadful news that ever was told in that world of misery. It is always a doleful time in hell; the world of darkness is always full of shrieks and doleful cries; but when the news is heard, that the day appointed for the judgment is come, hell will be filled with louder shrieks and more dreadful cries than ever before. . . . . Then must the souls of the wicked come up to be united to their bodies, and stand before their Judge. They shall not come willingly, but shall be dragged forth as a malefactor is dragged out of his dungeon to execution. . . . . They will hang back, but must come; the devils and damned spirits must come up together. . . . . Then the sentence shall be executed. When the Judge bids them depart, they must go, however loth, yet they must go, . . . and that great company of devils and wicked men must then enter those everlasting burnings to which they are sentenced.

"In this condition they shall remain throughout the never ending ages of eternity. Their punishment shall be then complete, and it shall remain in this completion for ever. Now shall all that come upon them which they so long trembled for fear of, while their souls were in a separate state. They will dwell in a fire that never shall be quenched, and here they must wear out eternity. Here they must wear out one thousand years after another, and that without end. There is no reckoning up the millions of years, or millions of ages; all arith-

metic here fails, no rules of multiplication can reach he amount, for there is no end. They shall have nothing to do to pass away their eternity, but to conflict with those torments: this will be their work for ever and ever; God shall have no other use or employment for them; *this is the way that they must answer the end of their being.* (!!) And they never shall have any rest, nor any atonement, but their torments will hold up to their height, and shall never go any easier by their being accustomed to them. Time will seem long to them, every moment will seem long to them, but they shall never have done with the ages of their torment."—*Works*, vol. ii. pp. 880—883, edit. 1840.

So preached the great Jonathan Edwards, one of the acutest metaphysicians that the world has ever seen. A good man, too, and a believer in the paternity of God, and the declaration of Scripture that "God is love." Is it possible that divine justice can demand such a vindication as he represents? It is not possible! That doctrine is monstrous; and must be as offensive to the holy and good Jehovah, as it is astounding to men. It is worthy of remark how such descriptions of the future punishment are destitute of Scripture phraseology; and when Scripture is quoted, it is always those passages which are capable of, and which, by comparison with other parts of the sacred writings, demand a more reasonable interpretation.

Edwards thus describes the influence which the sight of the torments of the condemned in hell will have upon the glorified saints:—

"When they (the saints) shall see how miserable others of their fellow-creatures are, who were naturally in the same circumstances with themselves; when they shall see the smoke of their torment, and the raging of the flames of their burning, and hear their dolorous shrieks and cries, and consider that they, in the meantime, are in the most blissful state, and shall surely be in it to all eternity; *how will they rejoice, ... How joyfully will they sing to God and the Lamb,* WHEN THEY BEHOLD THIS!" —*Works*, vol. ii. p. 209, edit. 1840.

This is the language of Edwards as a theologian, not of Edwards the man and the Christian. Neither humanity nor religion will endure a representation so horribly revolting. If such a spectacle will excite the rapturous pleasure of the *saints*, it will be no pleasure to the GOD of saints. How strikingly does the following contrast with the above! "HAVE I ANY PLEASURE AT ALL *that the wicked should die, saith the Lord God; and not that he should return from his ways and live? . .* I HAVE NO PLEASURE *in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God: wherefore turn yourselves and live ye.*"—Ezekiel xviii. 23, 32.

—o—

RECEIPTS BY PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE *during August.* From a friend in New York, by Br. Blain, - - - - - $25 00
From friends in Newark, N. J., - - 2 00

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER, 1853.

THE AWAKENING ADVANCES.—We noticed the "*Awakening Begun*" in our last, but little thought we would have so soon to record the *advancing* of the good work; but the "*Christian Advocate and Journal*," the great organ of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, has given its million power to strike a blow for liberty of conscience, and to drive to death the engines of clerical power —*human creeds.* It opens its battery, July 28th, *editorially*, as follows, under the head of "*Church Government*":—

After ages of controversy, no one has been able to deduce from the Scriptures any form of Church government instituted by our Lord and his apostles, and made of perpetual obligation on Christians through future time; nor is there any Christian denomination on earth that can claim to be organized upon a plan evidently inferred from the primitive model of the Apostolic Church. Indeed, there does not appear to have been an entire uniformity of plan in the prudential regulations of the numerous Churches founded by the apostles. As the first converts were Jews, it was natural that they should copy the model of the synagogues, in regard to order and government, but not as divinely appointed; for the synagogues themselves were not a divine institution, but a prudential human arrangement, adopted after the return from the Babylonish captivity. But in Churches, either wholly formed of heathen converts, or with only a small intermixture of Jews, it is likely that the limited polity of the synagogue could not be stretched to the necessities of Christian organizations, and were more or less departed from as occasion demanded. It is evident from the history of our Lord's sojourn and ministry, given by the evangelists, that he did not institute any particular or exclusive form of Church organization among his disciples; and in the commission which he gave to his apostles, after his resurrection, there is not a syllable concerning Church government."

The ground here occupied we took twelve years ago, and on it we have stood from that time till now. That the followers of Christ will and should assemble together is true; but as love brings them together, so love must keep them in one body; and any attempt to *force unity* is the direct way to "cause divisions and offences;" and such persons always end in bigotry and a persecuting sectarianism, which destroys love, and renders the actors any thing but loving followers of Christ.

The editor of the Christian Advocate, Dr. T. E. Bond, proceeds to say, that Christ,

To qualify his apostles for the exercise of the ministry he had committed to them, he promises that the Comforter, which he would send in his name, shall bring to their remembrance whatsoever he had said to them—the whole system of doctrine he had orally communicated to them, and so enlighten their under-

standings as to enable them to comprehend its import and application. He does not promise to communicate to them a new gospel, through the Holy Spirit, or to make any addition to that he had already taught: and accordingly St. Paul expressly disclaims any authority over the FAITH of his converts, and forbids them to receive any other gospel, though he himself, or an angel from heaven, should come to them teaching it. Like the law, communicated orally by Jehovah on Mount Sinai, the gospel communicated by our Lord to his chosen apostles, or messengers, was complete, and could admit of neither alteration nor addition. And this FAITH once delivered to the saints was communicated entire to each of those messengers. They had no occasion to settle the terms of the glad tidings they were to bear "to every creature" by conference or consultation, and by a majority of votes. Hence the apostle Paul, when he received his commission from our Lord himself, nearly thirty years after his ascension, received, at the same time, an oral communication of the whole gospel, and entered at once upon the exercise of his ministry without "consulting with flesh and blood"—without conference with any of the other apostles. Of this he assures us in the most unequivocal manner.

From whence, then, is the notion derived, that the apostles constituted an ecclesiastical corporation, or acted upon any of the principles which control or regulate such bodies? There is no intimation of it in the Scriptures. If they had been directed so to act, we should find it in the record of the Acts of the Apostles, by their historian, St. Luke; but there is no account in this history of any convention or assembly of an apostolic college. They never so settled the "faith once delivered to the saints." It never was determined by vote in a council of those to whom it had been orally communicated severally, and entirely, by their Lord. Whence, then, have divines and theologians derived this notion of an apostolic corporation, or college?

This is a home thrust; and, if we mistake not, will make quite a fluttering among *creed makers*. We are glad to find Dr. Bond, in this matter, occupying the same ground as Dr. McCulloh, whose work we so recently noticed; ground which we have, substantially, occupied the last twelve years; and it is the only position that can be occupied and stand on the Bible. Those who leave this position leave the Bible to follow the *traditions* of men, in our judgment. Dr. Bond goes on to say:

But if the apostles themselves did not act as a corporation, did they constitute and appoint any such ecclesiastical corporation to succeed to such authority after their departure? The presumption is against it; and the Scriptures do not warrant it. The apostles taught only what their Lord had taught them; and they have left their testimony of record for the individual instruction of all men. The Holy Scriptures contain the faith at first delivered to the saints—the whole gospel message as delivered by our Lord to his apostles; and in these records we find no account of their having instituted an ecclesiastical corporation, either of bishops, presbyters, or elders, with power to prescribe authoratively the faith of the gospel. The apostles themselves neither had nor exercised any such authority as a college, or corporation: they only declared and published the faith, the gospel, as revealed to them personally by Him who gave them their commission. How, then, could they delegate such powers to others? To claim such authority has been the great sin of the Churches, and the fruitful source of spiritual pr de and corruption, both of doctrine and discipline, in all ages since the apostles and their immediate converts were removed from the earth; if it was not the mystery of iniquity which had already begun to work, even under the apostolic administration, and of which the great apostle to the Gentiles apprises us.

Here again is good sound sense, and truth well spoken. We do hope it will be laid to heart by the large denomination Dr. Bond is connected with. If it is heeded they will soon find *revolution* is the order of the day in ecclesiastical matters, and Christian men will begin to feel that their responsibility is to God and not to *self-constituted* bodies who usurp the place of God in matters of faith. Truly has Dr. B. said, "to prescribe authoratively the faith of the gospel * * * has been the *great sin* of the Churches," &c. May the Lord help ministers and laymen to see this truth, and to cast away this *lordship* and come back to the primitive simplicity of "forbearing one another in love," while differences of opinion may and will exist on various points in reference to Bible teaching. Liberty to express our differences in a Christian spirit—that is, the spirit of love—must be enjoyed, and it must not interrupt Christian affection. When this point is attained the direct tendency will be to unity of faith, and once more it will be said "*See how these Christians love one another.*"

Dr. Bond in speaking of primitive congregations in their church action, says:

"If any church or society had enacted a rule which contravened a law of Christ, or added any Christian obligation not in conformity with the faith of the Gospel, it would have been nugatory, and of no effect; no one church, nor any confederation of churches, being authorized to alter or amend the divine code, for this code was complete. It was not merely a constitution authorizing subordinate legislation under its provisions, and committing such legislation to the churches, either in their individual or confederate capacities, much less to a corporation of bishops or presbyters. The conditions of salvation, and consequently the conditions of church fellowship, had been fixed and absolutely determined by the Head of the Church himself, and communicated to his chosen messengers. Over these the apostles themselves had no dominion—could not alter or substitute; and surely no higher authority than theirs existed in the primitive church. Rules and regulations for carrying into effect the commandments of Christ, belonged to every church organization, according to the circumstances in which they were providentially placed, but beyond this, no church, whether individual or

confederate, had a right to go. To go further would have been to 'lord it over Christ's heritage,' and this would have been to renounce their allegiance to the only rightful Lord and Lawgiver, to whom is given by the Father all power in heaven and in earth."

Here also is truth clearly expressed: may it be pondered well. The Doctor next proceeds to show when and how the church was led away from its primitive simplicity, and speaks as follows:

Very early in the third century, if not earlier, this restriction upon ecclesiastical authority was lost sight of, and the consequence was that the "commandments of men" were substituted for the commandments of Christ. The clergy assumed to be a divine corporation, with authority to dictate the faith of the church; to exclude from the ministry all who did not subscribe to their dogmas; and which dogmas were decided upon by vote taken in council, and determined by majorities, whose decisions everybody knows are not infallible. And hence both the faith and the discipline of the church came to rest upon canons and councils, not upon the Scriptures; and which canons are often contradictory of each other, and moreover mutable, as succeeding councils claim the right to alter and amend the laws made by those which preceded them.

After this expose of the "clergy" and their assumptions, the Doctor speaks out in the following manly and Christian language, which if we had uttered it—and we have more than once—would have been treated with contempt. May it now be heeded, seeing it comes in the organ of the Methodist Episcopal church. He says:

We think the time has come to repudiate men-made canons, and confessions of faith, and go back to the Scriptures as the perfect rule, and the only perfect rule of both faith and practice. These "have God for their author, salvation for their end, and truth, without any admixture of error, for their matter." On the Scriptures, then, we can safely rely, as we cannot rely upon any human dictation, whether of the many or the few—whether of individual theologians, or doctors of divinity; or of ecclesiastical corporations, assuming, without divine warranty, to impose their notions upon the church of Christ, under the names of canons, or creeds, or confessions of faith. "To the law and to the testimony," if they speak not according to these, it is because there is no light in them.

This really makes us breathe easier. Praise the Lord that the *Awakening is advancing*.

Dr. Bond concludes in the following strong and manly language, which we commend to all creed-bound souls, and hope they may feel that the time has come for Christian men to enjoy a little liberty to think for themselves, without incurring the imputation of being *infidels*, because they cannot subscribe to those sectarian dogmas which have been forced on us from our childhood by some well-meaning, but superstitious, offshoots from Papal ignorance and blasphemy; for such is the character of much that is passed for "Orthodox." Dr. Bond's concluding remarks are as follows:

But it may be asked, Is every man qualified to derive a saving knowledge of Gospel truth from the Bible, or to ascertain the authenticity and truth of the Scriptures without receiving them upon the testimony of the Church? To both questions we answer, Yes—yes, absolutely, and unqualifiedly. Every reader or hearer can derive a knowledge of the *faith* that saves him from the Scriptures, much more certainly than from the creeds and confessions dictated by human authority; for these often conflict with each other, and to decide which is right he must enter into the interminable labyrinth of metaphysical speculation. And to take any one of these authorities upon trust, is to renounce all accountability whatever, for what he believes or does. But he cannot be released from either one or the other, by any man or set of men. We are not allowed to call any man master or lord of our faith. But our only rightful Lord and Sovereign, has said, that "if any man will do the will of my Father, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be true." He cannot but see the requirements of the Gospel, and if he will comply, he will feel their remedial efficacy on his heart and life, and know they are of God. He will see, too, that the Gospel confers upon him the right to go to the throne of the heavenly grace, through the mediation of his great High Priest, for all Gospel blessings, and among them for divine illumination. "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him." This wisdom cometh down from the "Father of Lights;" not through ecclesiastical corporations or councils, and adulterated by the profane admixture of metaphysical speculation, but pure from the fountain of truth itself, and direct to individual consciousness. The unlettered, humble believer has then only to remember the promise of his Lord: "Then shall ye know, if ye follow on to know;" and thus be led into all "the length, and breadth, and depth, and height" of Gospel privileges and blessings; and know the love of God that passeth human understanding in the exercise of its natural powers: "For because he is a son, God sends forth the spirit of his Son into his heart, crying, Abba Father."

"Analytical Investigations *Concerning the Credibility of the Scriptures*," &c. "By J. H. McCulloh, M. D."

We have several times spoken of this work, and we do most heartily recommend it to all persons who have the means to procure it. It can be had of R. T. Young, 140 Fulton street, New York. Price $3.75.

We have the pleasure to inform brethren Ham and Moncrieff that Dr. McCulloh has made us a donation of two copies of the above work to be forwarded to them, with the request that they will notice, in each of their magazines, that the work can be had at Chapman's in the Strand, London. We shall forward the work immediately by private conveyance to Manchester, England; from which

place it will be forwarded. Accompanying the work we shall also send, to each of those brethren, a copy of "*Bible vs. Tradition*," and a copy of the pamphlet by Br. Blain entitled "*Death not Life*," which they will please accept.

We give the following very brief *recapitulation* of Dr. McCulloh's work, from vol. ii. p. 443–5.

I have shown that from an examination of the visible world, nothing can be inferred concerning the nature, attributes, or purposes of the Creator of the universe. Though his infinite power and skill are manifested by his works, yet that inference is so clogged by the non-exhibition of any moral superintendence of the world, that the merits of the conclusion to be deduced from the whole subject are so entirely divided between the utterly opposite inferences of the atheists and deists, that it is impossible to attain to any firm or certain conviction. Our investigations on Natural Theology, and exhibition of the termination of all philosophic speculation in absolute scepticism, I apprehend establishes the conclusions we have made in the clearest point of view.

In this state of utter perplexity and doubtfulness we took up the Scripture writings, and in them we found a full solution of every difficulty unsolved in the discussions between the atheists and deists. The Scriptures inform us, that Jehovah the Creator of all things, infinite in power and all excellence of moral attributes, has placed mankind as intellectual and moral free agents in a probationary condition, in which they are, through their voluntary self-discipline, to qualify themselves for a future state of existence, which will be either happy or miserable according to their own action in the case. If the Scriptures are revelations from God, every matter is explained that concerns either human conduct, or Jehovah's position towards them, whether in his providential, or in his apparently non-providential superintendence. In either case it leaves no perplexity as to the infinite power, wisdom, and excellence of his nature and attributes.

To prove that the Scriptures are revelations from God, we have produced through an analysis of the institutions of Moses, and the functions and conduct of the priesthood and prophets, an amount of evidence as to the credibility of the Scripture writings which I should presume to be irresistible. It comprehends an amount of circumstantial evidence of unimpeachable disinterested integrity, wholly unparalleled in the history of human action; and when this astonishing amount of evidence *simply sustains a moral system, the most perfect for promoting human welfare and happiness that can be conceived of*—it seems to me impossible for any unprejudiced man to hold a rational doubt as to the fact that the Scriptures are from divine revelation.

In the next place I have shewn that in the fact of mankind's probationary condition as intellectual and moral free agents left to themselves, there is nothing perplexing in the circumstance that they have in various instances corrupted the system of things appointed in the Scriptures for human observance. Hence as free agents, men have with a perverse ingenuity often worked up schemes of religious observance for themselves, which though seemingly founded upon the teaching of the Scriptures, were in reality perversions of truth, and sometimes in their consequences induced an action directly the contrary to what the Scriptures inculcated.

To vindicate the Scriptures from the obloquy thus brought upon them by those who perverted their meaning, at the same time that they professed to follow their teaching, I have gone into very full investigations as to what the Scriptures do require from human faith and obedience, and I trust the simplicity, harmony and consistency of the expositions made on these subjects are so striking, that no intellectual christian can mistrust the substantial truth of what I have laid before the reader as being the plain requirements of the Scripture writings.

Now to the array of proof that I have given, what objection have atheists, deists, or sceptics to make? I can imagine nothing unless it may be said, that after all I have written, I have not made a demonstration that removes their unbelief. To such a remark it is evident no reply can be made, as no one can undertake to prove the cogency of any process of reasoning. I shall therefore only observe, that as an absolute demonstration of moral or religious truth cannot be made, since it would be inconsistent with a state of intellectual and moral probation, so, the intellectual responsibility of mankind can only be determined in the choice they make between probable opinions or inferences. He that chooses the one the least probable, either wants intellectual sagacity or is influenced by unjustifiable considerations. No one however can deceive the judge of mankind as to this matter, and considering the enormous consequences depending upon human action in the case, I can only recommend the infidel reader to re-estimate the considerations through which he has determined that the Scriptures are not a revelation from the Creator of the Universe.

As respects the christian reader, I have nothing to say in vindication of the expositions made by me concerning the system of things that I apprehend to be taught in the volume of Scripture writings, for I have stated at every step my reasons for coming to such conclusions. I can only say for myself on these matters, that as I have been fully aware of the responsibility assumed by the publication of this work, so I have diligently exerted myself not only to ascertain what was the truth, but with the full determination to be faithful in announcing the whole truth.

DEATH NOT LIFE: or *The Theological Hell and Endless Misery Disproved; and the Doctrine of Destruction Established*, by a collection and explanation of all passages on future punishment. Also Metaphysical Arguments for the Immortality of the Wicked Exploded. By Jacob Blain, Baptist Minister of Buffalo, N. Y."

Such is the title page of a work of 120 pages, 12 mo., just issued, and for sale at our office, and by the Author. It deals in strong language, and is especially cutting to those theological teachers who, while they profess to have the "keys of knowledge," keep the people in ignorance of the true sense of those terms on which they attempt to build the worse than Moloch fires, which in theological parlance they call "*hell*." We are glad to

see works multiplied on this subject, though we may not agree with all the sentiments they contain. Let this new comer be scattered far and wide. Price 25 cents in paper covers. Six copies for $1. We give the following extract from Br. Blain's work, from his chapter headed, "*A Brief Review and Results:*"

We have now examined and referred to all the texts relied on to prove immortality and endless woe, and let us see the result.

1. We have showed that thirty or more texts relied on, are entirely silent as to *endless* woe, and I have called them neuter.

2. That fifty-four texts with the word *hell* in them, so far as any of them relate to future punishment, prove the *destruction* of the wicked. These two classes with the 210 texts for destruction, making 294, have been stolen to prove endless misery, and must be given up, as Destructionists have a *legal* demand on them.

3. Of the fifteen remaining texts relied on, I have proved that eight of them tell only earthly judgments, both by comparing them with the other texts, and their being given up by Fuller, Edwards, Barnes. Lord, and others.

4. That twelve have no proof of *endless* woe in them only what is derived from the variable words *for ever and everlasting*, and that in reality the whole proof rests on them.

5. That seven of them have the word *fire* in them, which in every case is figurative, and in Bible judgments, is a universal symbol of *destruction* of men and things.

6. That some, as John 3: 36, and 2 Thess. 1: 9, are positive proof of *destruction*, unless we add to the Bible to make them otherwise—while others, which relate to a doom in the future world, as "the *mists* of *darkness*," &c., favor extinction more than preservation in woe.

7. That not one is a *plain positive witness* for endless misery, and the strongest are given up by the best writers. If any speak in its favor, their testimony is extremely doubtful or inferential, so as not to make out even a *prima facia* case.

8. What confirms the last remark is, I have proved *all* the texts to be in *figurative language*, such as the best Bible critics say can establish no doctrine, even if there be no opposing texts—especially must they fail, if there be *any plain* opposing texts. I just ask here, if we have not *plain* texts for destruction?

Well does a learned writer remark—"a doctrine or sentiment so infinitely opposed to reason and conscience, so awfully revolting, and utterly incredible as that of *eternal suffering*, ought *certainly* not to be founded on, or inferred from a few *parabolic, mystic, poetic, idiomic, proverbial, local,* and *symbolic* sentences." But, strange to tell, every text or sentence relied on to prove this terrific doctrine, belongs to one of these classes.

There has been a great outcry against Wm. Miller for being positive about the prophesies, seeing they are so symbolic; but those who are positive that they find eternal torments in a future world, in the above named figurative texts, betray a hundred fold more folly than Miller did, as the consequences of error on this point, are immensely greater, God is dishonored, and christendom filled with infidels by it.

In courts of law these three rules are observed: first, the *character* of the witnesses; second, the *plainness* and *positiveness* of their testimony; third, where they are *positive* on both sides, and no blot is on their character, the *number* on either side determines the case. Now apply these rules to the issue before us. Of course no blot on the *character* of the witnesses (texts) can be admitted, and so their *plainness* and their *number* must decide the case. Of their *plainness*, good sense must decide. Divide 210 by 15, and the result is 14 to 1 on the side of *destruction*. Deduct the eight which I have proved to refer only to earthly judgments, and the result is 30 to 1. On such testimony in a suit, would not the opposing lawyer be told that his case was a desperate and hopeless one?

The fact is, if men reasoned on a worldly subject as they do on this, it would be thought worthy of nothing better than *ridicule*, unless it was as *popular* as theologians have made *immortality* and an *eternal hell.*

It is unaccountably strange too that the *number* of texts should be so small, both when we consider the awfulnesss of the doctrine, and the number of texts telling the *final* reward of the righteous, and other cardinal doctrines. They are *few* too, when, as I have said, we find more than 3,000 warnings, threatenings, and denunciations made, in relation to the *temporary* consequence of sin. If the common theory be true, who can tell why our merciful Father should feel so *deeply* for the welfare of his creatures in this short life, and feel and say so little about their woes that were to be unending? Yes, and for 4,000 years say *nothing* about those woes, nor warn to escape them!!

The profound mind of John Foster said, "May we not think that, if *so transcendently dreadful a doctrine had been meant to be taught*, there would have been such forms of proposition, of circumlocution, if necessary, as would have rendered all doubt or question a mere palpable absurdity." See his noted 'letter to a young minister,' who, by the by, proves to be Edward White, a Congregational minister, now of London, who has written an able work to prove the doctrine I hold. Its title is, "Life only in Christ." If Foster had criticised the *Bible* as his pupil has, he would not have given the preference to restorationism. He names the two doctrines and says, "One of them must be the truth, but acknowledges he had not directed much thought to *annihilation.*"

I know the word *hell* will be clung to as proof of a *world* to be inhabited by wretched beings. An old proverb says, 'a man may tell a falsehood so often as to finally believe it a truth;' and in like manner the word *hell* has been reiterated, till Christians think it is outrageous sacrilege to disturb it. Like purgatory to the Catholics, it has become a *darling word* and conclusive proof of orthodoxy.

I have proved that Christ only meant to tell a disgraceful death by being "cast into Gehenna," and not that there would be such a *place* eternally.

If men who think clearly on other subjects, could get this idea into their snarled-up and conceited minds, we should hear no more of a "dismal world, deep in the *imaginary* regions of despair; where God-almighty ('who is *love' itself*)

has stored up some *unknown* materials of *vengeance*, sufficient to last through eternity"—(blasphemous language! !)

I will justify the remark that our ministry are too *conceited* and dogmatical, by a sentence of the great and Godly Dr. Vinet. He says, "Even now, after eighteen centuries of christianity, we are *very probably involved in some enormous error*, of which christianity will at some future time make us ashamed." The doctrine of an eternal hell for endless woe, is such an "*enormous error*," and the church will yet be *ashamed* of it. Yet most are as *positive* there is such a place as if they had seen it with their own eyes. "Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight." Isa. 5: 21.

We have now before us the foundation of the mighty fabric—*immortality* and consequent *eternal torments*, for a greater share of our race—we see its length, and breadth, and *solidity*. On this foundation our opponents *profess* to feel as secure as soldiers in Gibraltar. I ask which looks most like a Gibraltar, these 15 texts, or the 210 quoted for *destruction !*

On such testimony, not only the doctrine of endless woe is founded, but also the following consequential doctrines, or items of belief.

1. That it is consistent with the *justice* of God, to *create* innumerable beings whom he knew or forsaw would be endlessly miserable, and curse him for their creation. [He is now causing to come into being about 60,000 daily. If half are lost, he is daily creating 30,000 for endless woe.] May not our sense of *justice* ask how long he will continue this work ! !

2. That it is in accordance with his *love, goodness, pity* and *mercy*, to *create*, and then afflict thus.

3. That it will be consistent with his *wisdom*, and *power*, to continue, *endlessly*, that "abominable thing he hates"—*sin*—also, thus to continue *misery*, in which "he delighteth not" and over which "he grieves." [Would it be *wise* in a king to permit rebellion, and consequent misery to continue for ever if he had power to end them ?]

4. That saints, and all holy beings in the universe, will be for ever the happier for this *continuance* of misery and sin; and hatred to themselves, their God and Redeemer. Mark—"*all things* work for good to all who love God."*

5. That saints, when made perfect in heaven, will be destitute of, or deprived of *qualities* which God commands them to possess in their present state—such as *pity, sympathy*, sorrow for others woes, "*good will to all*," &c.

Do not flinch, brethren—these items of belief are the unavoidable fruit of your system—the legitimate children of hell-torment teachers, and they must own them, and cherish them, though *forbidding in their appearance.*

Prof. Stuart, (see Biblical Repository, July, 1840,) was so troubled with two of these items of faith, that he made this astounding remark—"Perhaps God may in *mercy extinguish our social susceptibilities in heaven*" ! ! Make us *hermits*, so that we can hear the groans of the damned, and stoic-like, be unmoved by their hopeless wail ! !

Surely the foundation for such a faith should have a pyramid-base---be supported by scores of plain texts, and no opposing ones---be made far more plain than the promise of *life* to the righteous: for if they should perish as the beasts, seeing they have sinned, God's *character* would remain untarnished in the view of his other creatures; and these creatures rejoice for ever that rebellion and woe had ceased to exist.

But I ask if the texts I have reviewed afford such a broad foundation? I ask with mingled feelings of joy and sorrow---joy, that God's word *does not* teach such a soul-chilling and God-dishonoring doctrine---with sorrow for the sad fact that most of "the excellent ones of the earth" are teaching it, and burthened by it---with sorrow, too, that the "blind are led by the blind, and both are fallen into the ditch" of error---a gloomy ditch, where wheat indeed grows, but is much "choaked" by "wood, hay and stubble," so that it cannot "bear sixty and a hundred fold."

After four years' examination, I am compelled to dissent from the view of some great and good men who have rejected endless woe. H. C. Dwight, A. M., and Professor Sears say, "That Dr. Tholuck, and other eminent and pious divines of Germany, who hold to restoration, acknowledge that the New Testament *seems* to inculcate the doctrine of eternal punishment, (meaning misery by the term punishment,) while others contend that it is not *apparently* announced there." The *latter* is my belief. I own everlasting punishment, not only *seems*, but is *plainly* taught, in the sense Pres. Edwards gives it, viz., "that *annihilation* is everlasting punishment;" but neither the New nor the Old Testament *seem* to teach everlasting *torments.* Take the 15 texts I have examined, and add to them the 12 with Gehenna in them, (those with sheol and hades, [hell] in, can be no witnesses) and weigh well the relative force of evidence among themselves, or give them a full criticism, and I fear not to affirm that they afford strong proof of utter destruction, without going to the 200 texts I have quoted; *unless* it be first proved from some other source, that the wicked are immortal---this we have seen cannot be done---the texts to prove they are to suffer for ever, are the only ones to prove they are immortal.

Strange as it may at first appear to my readers, yet it can be shown that we have, in reality, no need to fetch our 210 swords into the battle-field, for like David, we can cut off Goliah's head with his *own sword.* I will show how this can be done by a little repetition. Of the fifteen texts I have proved that eight tell only earthly woes---two *plainly* prove destruction---add to these two the eleven with Gehenna in, (in James it is no proof,) and as Gehenna is a perfect symbol of destruction, we have thirteen to overbalance the five remaining ones of the fifteen. And these five are merely inferential. One of them, Matt. 24: 41, "Depart into everlasting fire," we have seen denotes destruction. This is telling briefly how Goliah's head can be cut off with his own sword.

* In Mount Auburn, (Boston,) I saw a lovely marble monument of a dear dead child, which the parents had obtained to keep in their house, but had to remove it, as they could not endure the sight; yet the marble child suffered not. Pres. Edwards and other great divines, who formed our systems of divinity, and whom the present clergy seem to think are infallible guides, say that the saints will see their friends writhe for ever in *literal fire.*

Let any one fully examine the Old Testament, and understand its symbols, figures, and poetic style, and then read the New Testament with special reference to this subject, and he will agree with me; *unless* some selfish interest warps his judgment, or his judgment itself is too weak to grasp an argument.

The neglect to take time (and it requires much time) for this examination, on the plan I have briefly adopted above, is one great reason why those great men erred.

But they with Bishop Newton, and the eminent John Foster, who erred in the same manner, took for *granted* that the wicked were *immortal*, and this was another grand cause of their error. They saw the New Testament *seemed* to intimate no *recovery* after the sentence at the final judgment; and this caused the confusion. The Bible *must seem* to contradict itself wofully while the immortality of the wicked is believed.

But a day-star of hope has arisen---the scales have fallen from many eyes, and I must believe that our God designs to give his people more enlarged views of his word and government.

The nineteenth centnry has regulated brains so as to use steam and lightning, and it will yet regulate them so as to use the figurative language of the Bible aright. A hint will be taken from the example of the "noble Bereans," and "Apollas," and to use a comparison, a telegraph line will be established between the Old and the New Testament. Newly constructed telescopes too, have enabled us to see far into the regions of *space*, and we believe the vision, the *power* of *thought*, will be magnified, so as to see far enough into *eternity* to discover that a *glorious eternal life* affords a sufficient *motive* to action while on earth; and that its *loss* at the judgment would be a punishment---yea an *everlasting punishment*---seen to be so by all the living, eternally.

The living perceiving the *loss* sustained by the dead, will constitute an eternal monument to exhibit the evil of sin, and God's displeasure against it, without having a State Prison, a Bastile, or an abominable Inquisition-dungeon left to pollute the fair universe.

In a sad delusion must the mind be, which conceives that God's allwise government will require such an exhibition for ever.

———o———

WORKS RECEIVED.—"*The British Christian Examiner*," also, "*The Expositor of Life and Immortality*," for August. [We are sorry to say the *Hymn Book* has not come to hand.] "*Essays Critical and Historical on the Temperance Question;*" also "First Prize Essay on the Nature, Elements, and Rites of the Christian Eucharist. Illustrated by Comparison with the Jewish Passover: by FREDERIC RICHARD LEES, Doct. Phil. Giessen: Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, Scotland, etc."

We are obliged to Dr. Lees for these works, and have read them with interest and profit; fully satisfied that fermented or alcoholic wine was never used at the Passover, and hence would not have been used by our Lord at the institution of the *Supper*. We are satisfied it was grape *jelly* or juice, diluted with hot water; thus forming both an agreeable and nutrative drink, but not intoxicating in the least degree, even when taken in large quantities; it was the "*fruit* of the vine." Intoxicating wine ought never to be used in the Lord's Supper: it is a *mockery*.

True Literalism: Being an Exposition of Especial Prophecies, according to the Principles of Literal Interpretation. By JOSEPH TURNER." Hartford, Conn.

Such is the title of an octavo pamphlet of 120 pages. Price, 20 cents; or $2 per dozen; $12 per hundred. For want of time, we have not been able to examine it; but those who desire to see it will send directly to the author for it.

———o———

"THE WHOLE TRUTH" ONCE MORE.—Br. Marsh in the Harbinger of Aug. 13th refers to this subject again, and publishes a part of our article in the last Examiner on this topic. He states the question at issue as follows:—

"*Is it our duty to teach the purpose of God in the redemption of fallen mortals, as a whole, as revealed in the Bible? Or, should we teach neglected parts only, of that purpose?*" He then adds, "We understand Br. Storrs to take the last position."

We are sorry Br. Marsh so *mis*-understands us. We feel quite sure our words do not necessarily convey any such sentiment. We said explicitly, "*The whole truth is to be preached, but it may not always be by one man, nor at one time.*" Surely, that is not saying that "we should teach neglected parts *only*." We admitted the "duty to proclaim the gospel *as a whole*." We said, "This is true as a *general* principle;" but asked, "Is it true in *specific* cases?" We think it was made plain that it is not; and that no man who advances in knowledge does practice it. Now, as Br. M. starts with an erroneous assumption of our position, we shall not follow him in detail through his three columns, as his remarks are founded upon a basis we do not occupy. We said, "Jesus did not preach the whole truth to his disciples *at once*." Br. M. will not pretend that he did; but says, "the spirit of truth" was to be given to guide them "*into all truth;*" and that "does not mean a part of it." But, did that spirit guide them into "all truth" *at once?* Surely it did not; for, several years after, Peter had to have a vision from heaven to satisfy him it was right to go to the Gentiles. Here is an instance of progressive teaching, and it relates to a *neglected* and overlooked truth. Paul's whole mission to the Gentiles was of a like character. Who

is to decide what is the whole truth? Do you say, It is the whole Bible. Very well: but who shall stand up and say, "The spirit of truth guides me into the whole truth so that I have nothing but the truth"? Br. M., we know, will not say that. If any other man does, he only shows his ignorance and folly; and he would be one of the last men on earth we would care to have any association with.

—o—

FROM A MOTHER IN ISRAEL.

The following is from the mother of Rev. Nathaniel Colver, an eminent Baptist minister. We sincerely wish he might be inspired with his mother's spirit.

Alford, Mass., July 24th, 1853.

Br. Storrs:—I feel very anxious for the Bible against Tradition, as I am in the midst of opposers and not many dare show themselves for fear of being cast out of the synagogue. I do all I can to scatter the seed, it may chance to lodge in some honest heart. There is some hope when there is life enough to struggle. Some think it awful infidelity! Oh! that the scales might drop from off their eyes, that they might see clearly, and see that Jesus died that all who believe in him might have Everlasting Life. I heard a minister say Jesus died to make us happy when we die, and to escort the soul home to glory. I asked him to tell me where the bridegroom would find his bride. He did not tell me, but said she would *be ready:* so you may guess as well as I. So much for the blindness of the present day. I send you one dollar, and would send you more if I could. Send what you think best, for there is none taken in this place except what I take. I have tried to get subscribers but cannot: so I must do all I can. It may in some future day do good; I don't expect to want them long, as I am almost seventy-six, but I am glad to see in my old age, and am glad I have one daughter not afraid to tell that she sees, but she is so far off I must, without complaining, be contented with reading from her in the Examiner.

Yours in hope of Eternal Life,
CATHERINE COLVER.

—

NOTE BY EDITOR.—The "*daughter*" spoken of, is Mrs. Catherine C. Williams, Elmira, N. Y.; who has labored most diligently to help on the knowledge of *Life only through Christ.*

—o—

FROM C. M. RICHMOND.

PERU, Ind., August 8, 1853.

Br. Storrs:—Since my last report, I have labored in Lewisburg, Chili, and Miami Town. The interest in the life theme is constantly increasing. Our congregations are larger and larger, and numbers, to my certain knowledge, are embracing the truth. Our orthodox friends are taking alarm, and begin to rally to the rescue of their cherished errors. The ministers in this section are preaching with all their might against our views; and hundreds are inquiring, "*What is truth?*" I think the prospect of doing good, in promoting the truth, has never been so cheering as now. Br. Hall very frequently accompanies me in my labors, and I find him a faithful fellow-laborer in this precious cause. I am now just on the eve of starting for La Fayette. May the effort there prove a successful one in promoting the truth. Your brother,

C. M. RICHMOND.

P. S.—My traveling expenses for the past quarter have been three dollars and fifty-four cents. The reason why this item is so small, is, I have traveled some on foot, and sometimes brethren have assisted me to and from my appointments, and Br. Hall is ever forward and free to assist me in this matter. C. M. R.

—

DIED, in Peru, Ind., July 18, 1853, *Br. Samuel Bosworth*, in the 66th year of his age. For nearly half a century, he lived a consistent, devoted Christian. His candor and faithfulness to the convictions of truth were seen from the fact that, as new light shone upon his mind from the sacred page, he was ready to receive it with joy, though it might cost him a sacrifice. He embraced the truth on the life and death doctrine, about two years ago, and thereafter took a deep interest in its advancement. He died in the joyful hope of a resurrection, when Christ should come in his glory. His funeral was attended by a large congregation at the Methodist church. Sermon by the writer, founded on Tit. 2: 13. "*Looking for that blessed hope,*" &c. According to Br. B.'s request, his *views were vindicated on the occasion.* I will close this short notice by an extract from a letter placed in my hand by a gentleman of this place, which he had received from an old friend of Br. B. residing in Buffalo. "You speak of my old friend Bosworth. He is one of the best men that ever lived.....The world will suffer a loss when that man dies. Such as he is, are the salt that preserves it from corruption—utter corruption. His very prayer is a host against the devil and the wickedness of men. Ten such men would have saved Sodom." C. M. R.

—o—

HOW IT SOUNDS.—We cut the following from one of our daily papers as a specimen of the perversion of Scripture, and the insult offered to common sense and truth, by the doctrine of the natural immortality of man. We call it *theological blasphemy* and nonsense.

"A marble monument in the form of an obelisk, has recently been put up in the old burying-ground in Concord, N. H., to mark the spot where lie the remains of the son of President Pierce, who lost his life by the accident on the Boston and Maine Railroad, in January last. The monument bears the following inscription: "BENJAMIN PIERCE, born April 13, 1831; died January 6, 1853: 'Go thy way—thy son liveth.'"

This is a fair specimen of the theological teaching of those who claim to be "*orthodox.*" It is a gross perversion of the words of Christ, and car-

ries a lie on the face of it. "BENJAMIN PIERCE *died*," says the inscription. Is that true? If so, then *he, the person* spoken of, *is dead.* To say to his father, in the next sentence, "Thy son *liveth*," is to utter a *falsehood*, and no theological patching can make it anything else. When our Lord said to the nobleman, who applied to him in behalf of his son who was sick nigh unto death, "Thy son liveth," what mockery it would have been, if on his return to his house, his servants had met him and said, "Thy son *died* yesterday, about the seventh hour." Would not the nobleman have said, Jesus spoke *falsely* when he said "Thy son liveth"? "Oh, no! he only meant his *immortal soul was alive*"! But to the honor of Christ and Christianity, the nobleman's son recovered from his sickness, and there was no need of *theological twattle* about meaning the *soul* "liveth."

We hope President Pierce has more faith in the Bible doctrine of *the resurrection of the dead* than to be deluded by such a *lie* as that inscribed on the monument over his son's grave. It is a "*False Marble.*" Jesus is the "Resurrection and the Life;" and whoever ascribes life to man or any part of man after death, except by a resurrection through Christ, the *Life-Giver*, robs Messiah, and charges him with falsehood in affirming himself to be "the resurrection and the life." It may have been done "ignorantly in unbelief;" of that we judge not, but leave the judgment with the Lord.

—o—

BEFORE THIS EXAMINER reaches some of our subscribers, we shall be on our way to our appointments in Michigan and Indiana. It is with some reluctance we go out on this long tour, as our health has been not the best during summer, and we are pressed with cares and calls nearer home; but through the importunity of friends we consented months since to undertake it; and we go, committing ourself, family, and concerns to God, whose providence is ever over those who put their trust in him. May our labor there be a blessing to all concerned, and we be brought again in peace to our habitation in due time. The Examiner for October will not be issued till our return, and will most likely be delayed a little beyond the usual time. May all our patrons be blessed of the Lord and guided to *Life Eternal.*

—o—

NEXT VOLUME OF THE EXAMINER.—Shall it be published *monthly, twice a month*, or *weekly?* If we have *one thousand paying* subscribers to *commence* the year with, we can publish *twice* each month without increasing the price. With a less number we cannot without loss. If we had *fifteen hundred paying* subscribers, at *two* dollars per year, we could publish *weekly.* With a less number we cannot venture it. The Examiner has been better sustained the present year than ever before; which to us is evidence that the principal theme of its columns is increasing in interest, for which we praise the Lord.

—o—

THE HARTFORD "BIBLE CONVENTION."—We had expected before this to have seen the Reported Speeches issued in Pamphlet; but have thus far looked in vain for their appearance. Br. Ham, in the *British Christian Examiner* for August, notices that Convention and two of its speakers as follows:

"AMERICA: *Hartford, Connecticut.*—A Convention has been held here with the object professedly of examining the authenticity of the Bible, but apparently to afford certain Deists, and advocates of "spirit manifestations," an opportunity to reiterate the old frivolous charges against the Scriptures as containing a revelation from God. We are truly grieved to see such men as Joseph Barker, once the Christian advocate, and Henry C. Wright, the author of "A Kiss for a Blow," among the Anti-Bible party. The sanguinary sentiments attributed to the latter, furnish a melancholy indication of the forgetfulness of those beautiful lessons which he so powerfully impresses on the young, in the little popular volume above referred to."

—o—

GOOD ADVICE.—We take the following from the *British* "*Christian Examiner*," and give it place for the sake of the excellent advice Br. Ham [the Editor] gives. We hope it may be heeded there and through this country. The advice is enclosed in brackets.

BIRMINGHAM.—"I am happy to let you know," writes a Correspondent, "that the cause of truth has taken root in this large town. A few of us have commenced meeting upon the first day of the week. We number about a *dozen.* The leading truths propagated by you seem to be thoroughly understood amongst us. I believe great good might be done here, if we had some one with *ability* to address the people. The present time would be a favorable opportunity, as the great mass of the people here seem quite tired of the present cold, monotonous state of things. I wish we were in a position to send you an invitation. I hope we soon shall be; at present, we are too poor." [Never mind your poverty, dear brethren; a "dozen" of you will be able to do noble duty in Birmingham. Don't become a *Sect*, but a society of spiritual people. Let the foundation of your Church union be *Christ*, not *dogmas*, nor *ordinances*; and, on this broad basis, you will unite men of "one heart and of one soul," if not entirely of one opinion. Keep us informed of your progress. We wish you God speed.—ED.]

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VIII. NEW YORK, OCTOBER, 1853. NO. 10

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 140 Fulton-street, (Up Stairs.)

TERMS.--Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS.

MR. D'ISRAELI, M.P., ON THE CRUCIFIXION OF CHRIST.

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM.

(*Continued from page* 133.)

THE following comments on the crucifixion of Christ, occur in Mr. D'Israeli's recently published work:—

"*If the Jews had not prevailed upon the Romans to crucify our Lord, what would have become of the atonement? But the human mind cannot contemplate the idea, that the most important deed of time could depend on human will. The immolators were pre-ordained like the victim, and the holy race supplied both.* COULD THAT BE A CRIME WHICH SECURED FOR ALL MANKIND ETERNAL JOY? WHICH VANQUISHED SATAN, AND OPENED THE GATES OF PARADISE? *Such a tenet would sully and impugn the doctrine that is the corner-stone of our faith and hope. Men must not presume to sit in judgment on such an act. They must bow their heads in awe and astonishment, and trembling gratitude.*"

"Anything more astounding than this," writes a reviewer, "was never, we venture to say, before put forth in the name of Divinity. If Mr. D'Israeli be right, the Apostle Peter must have been wrong, when he spoke of the Jews as having with *wicked* hands crucified and slain our Redeemer. Judas, too, instead of being a criminal of the deepest dye, for having betrayed his master, must by that betrayal have performed a meritorious action. Instead of being the son of perdition, he should have been called the son of salvation. He committed suicide under a great misconception. Instead of being the victim of the intolerable pangs of a reproving conscience, he ought, according to the Member for Buckinghamshire, to have regarded his betrayal of the Saviour, with unbounded self-complacency," &c.

Now, here is a phenomenon in religious development, deserving the attention of all pious and religious persons. The reviewer is no doubt right in representing Mr. D'Israeli's opinions as at variance with the representations of the New Testament; but it behooves us to ask, where is the flaw in the honorable Member's reasoning? The theological position of Mr. D'Israeli is briefly this:—He admits the popular views of the atonement to be Scriptural, and he admits, besides, that the Jews were the active agents in causing the Saviour's death. If, then, he reasons, the death of Christ was demanded for great judicial purposes in the moral administration of God, and if that death was necessary to the salvation of men, then he virtually asks,—Why should the Jews be blamed for the part they took in this necessary and highly beneficial act? But they *are* blamed in the New Testament, as we have already seen, and Mr. D'Israeli's *logical* conclusion is thus at variance with the representations of the sacred writings. The logic of the political theologian is unimpeachable, but the conclusion is Anti-Scriptural and wrong. Then our only recourse is to question the soundness of the premises from which such a conclusion is deduced; that is to say, to question the soundness of the *popular theory* of the atonement, which admits such conflicting inference with the obvious statements of Scripture. Mr. D'Israeli is conscious, as all must be, of the confusion of all rational and moral ideas in the mind, while contemplating the accepted theory of the death of Christ; and he proposes the unsatisfactory and dangerous expedient of crushing all thought upon the subject, in language which has the semblance of becoming submission and piety, but which, in fact, is the well-spring of a deep and destructive infidelity. He will not question the so-called orthodox theory, but he will accept an irrational and most painfully perplexing proposition, which the mental and moral constitution of the mind instinctively repels, and recommend others to the same false and fatal contentment. "Men must not presume," he says, "to sit in judgment on such an act. They must bow their heads in awe and astonishment, and trembling gratitude." Dangerous advice, to counsel the judging faculty to be dormant! How unlike the great Apostle to the Gentiles, when he said, "I speak as unto wise men: judge ye what I say."

Many have, no doubt, experienced this painful embarrassment, in common with the honorable member for Buckinghamshire, and like him have escaped from the mental perplexity, by laying an embargo on the understanding. But that is a mistaken piety, and seriously damaging in its influence, which encourages a faith not merely above reason, but obviously contrary to it. The claims of the Christianity of the Bible are never defiant of the mental and moral constitution of man. The truths of the Christian religion invariably appeal to the reason and moral sense of humanity, and he is an unwise counsellor who advises a faith which disregards these great rudiments of our nature. Infidelity triumphs when reason is trampled on in the name, and at the dictation of religion. Let the intellectual and moral judgment speak when appealed to: let them utter their combined voice *here*, for their voice will be found concurrent with the judgment of God and his Christ. The crucifixion of Christ was a *heinous sin:* so say all—God, Christ, Christian apostles, judge, executioner, spectators, and the betrayer himself. Why should the moral judgment of mankind, refuse to speak out its secret consentaneous "Even so," when *such* voices have

already spoken? The Bible never represents the crucifixion of Christ, as subserving any great judicial purpose in the moral administration of God over his creatures, but always points to it as the evidence of a culminating depravity, and high hostility to the holy Majesty of heaven. Why should not the human reason—why should not the moral sense of mankind record their united judgment, for they utter the same voice? Say not, ye priests of a popular prejudice, that we must hush this voice within: for that were to stifle the ready response of a religious faith, inasmuch as there is no true faith where there is no reason. An irrational religion must be as hateful to God as it is dishonorable and dangerous to men. Ye are plotting against the faith, trampling out the embers of an already expiring piety, and aiding to spread over the land the black pall of a deadly infidelity, when ye so preach. Christianity respects the human constitution—intellectual and moral—it is framed with a regard to this constitution, and will ye seek to destroy the radical elements of this constitution? In so doing, ye pluck out the eye and cut out the tongue of man's intellectual and moral nature. He is left by you with neither a moral percipient, nor a tasting faculty. He is blind, and cannot henceforth see; he has no palate for the great principles of piety, and he is driven by necessity to a moral life, where all is dark and vapid; he hurries to the dreariness and desolation of infidelity, and ye have preached him thither! Yes, ye priestly revilers of reason, ye have preached him thither; for men will think, must think, and ye forbid them to think. Men will worship with the understanding as well as with the heart, and ye forbid them so to worship. Ye virtually tell them that the God ye serve demands reasonless worshippers, and they stop not, alas! to ask if ye malign the God ye worship, but turn away altogether from God, whom ye have taught them to regard as the enemy of free thought and speech. Much of infidelity is the product of your preaching, ye priests! Ye have scattered the flock by your doctrines, and think ye have all the while been doing God service!

THE LOGIC OF FACTS.

We have appealed to the facts recorded in the evangelical narratives, with the view of furnishing the true Scriptural reply to the question we have raised, How came the Cross, that instrument of ignominy and death, to be identified with the history of the Holy Son of God? But although much light has been cast upon the subject by the ambiguous evidence of these facts, it is capable of yet further elucidation, and to this additional evidence we now turn.

Allusion has already been made to the parable of the wicked husbandmen, for the purpose of showing that, in the judgment of the Almighty Father, and of Jesus himself, the crucifixion was the highest expression of human wickedness; and that so far from its being demanded by God for any purpose connected with his own righteous government of his creatures, it was regarded by him as a new and most heinous resistance of his government, deserving a very severe and summary punishment. So far from the crucifixion making the forgiveness of sins possible, it was the addition of another and the greatest of all sins, to the already mighty catalogue of human guilt, needing itself to be forgiven by the infinite clemency of God. So Christ viewed it in his parable, and so he evidently considered on the cross, when he lifted up his benignant and forgiving voice to his Father, and prayed him to be merciful towards his murderers:—"Father, forgive them for they know not what they do." To the parable of the wicked husbandmen we again turn, for it contains some further explanation of the circumstances which led to our Lord's rejection and crucifixion by the Jews.

This parable, we are informed, was directed against the Chief Priests and Scribes of Israel, and that these Jewish dignitaries saw this: "they perceived that he had spoken this parable against them." And why against *them?* Obviously because they had a chief part in putting Christ to death. They were the "husbandmen" whom the Lord describes as saying, at the sight of their lord's son, "This is the heir, come let us kill him, that the inheritance may be ours." Here Christ plainly speaks out the motive which induced the spiritual chiefs of Israel to imbrue their hands in his blood. He was the "heir," the heir of "an inheritance." He was not tolerated by these priestly magnates, because his principles clashed with certain priestly "interests." His preaching spoilt the priestly profession. "If we let him alone," said the orthodox priesthood, "all men will believe on him;" which was tantamount to their saying, "All men will cease to believe on us." The church was in danger. The loaves and fishes were in danger. The uppermost seats in the synagogue, and greetings in the market-places, were in danger. Their professional distinction as Rabbis—the Reverends and Right Reverends of the people—their "livings," as the tithe-appropriators and consumers, were jeopardized by the new Reformer of Galilee. Our "inheritance" will be gone, said they, "if we will let him alone." He, this upstart son of the common people, will be the "heir" of the people's confidence and the honor of the people's hearts; "this is the heir, come let us kill him, that the *inheritance* may be ours."

Here, then, is the proximate cause of Christ's death on the cross revealed by the Lord Jesus himself. That awfully wicked event was accomplished by the priests and rulers of the people, who were instigated thereto by Satanic selfishness, the lust of priestly domination, place, pecuniary profit, and social preferment. The popular violence against Christ was fomented by the priesthood, under the influence of a sordid rapacity. The "*inheritance*," that was what they cared for:—"Come let us kill him, that the *inheritance may be ours.*" *An* answer, if not *all* the answer, is by this parable clearly given to the question we have asked, How came the Cross to be a part of the history of the Lord Jesus Christ? The mission of Christ clashed directly with the profits of a professional priesthood—damaged and threatened to totally alienate the priestly "inheritance." It had no respect for the "vested interests" of priestcraft. It was working too radical a reformation—unmasking too ruthlessly hypocritical sanctimony—tearing away too roughly the purple and fine linen of a well-beneficed clergy. Christ was too holy, too truthful to be tolerated by the priests of Israel; and they put him to death because they could not, and would not, endure him.

The history of the crucifixion thus far presented, is derived from the plain records of the Evangelists. The facts are potent and undisputed. Whoever

may disagree with this historical sketch, must find his justification, not in the statement of the facts, but in the view which we take of these facts. Here is the point of divergence where we part company with the conventionally styled "orthodox." His theory or explanation of these facts is altogether different from our own. He, as well as ourselves, accept the facts, but not the same inferences from these facts which we are constrained to draw. It should be well observed that our "orthodox" opponent has *no Scriptural authority for his deductions*. Neither the Old nor the New Testament expresses formally his speculative view of the Cross—there lie the facts, but nowhere, that doctrinal scheme which he accepts as the true theory of these facts. The Bible nowhere *says* that Christ was *punished* for our sins—that he endured, *as a substitute for mankind, the infinite wrath of God* —that he gave to Divine justice a full and complete *satisfaction* for the sins of the world—that his *merits are placed to the believer's account*, which he appropriates *by believing that they are thus appropriable*, and which constitute *the moral ground of his personal acceptance with God.* Nowhere, we repeat, are such doctrines contained in the sacred Scriptures. They are mere speculations of theologians, old and "orthodox," but not Scriptural. The *phraseology* of these popular doctrines is quite foreign to the Bible—the *terms* in which they are expressed, are never met with there.

Now, the faith of the larger proportion of the professing church, is cheated into the acknowledgment of these speculative doctrines, by the assurance that *they* express the true Scriptural idea of the Christian Atonement. To deny these theories is always declared to be the denial of the *atonement.* Anything more palpably illogical and unjust is scarcely conceivable. We do not deny—God forbid!—that the Scriptures reveal a doctrine of atonement; what we deny is, that the *popular* and so-called "orthodox" notions are *the true exposition* of the Scriptural atonement. To deny a particular theory of atonement, may surely be a very different thing from the denial of the atonement itself. If that theory be the true theory, then to deny it, is virtually to deny the atonement. But it makes strongly against the probability of the truth of the popular theory, that its distinctive propositions, even its terminology, cannot be found in the sacred volume, while at the same time, a large body of facts there are absolutely irreconcilable with it. It cannot fail to strike every reflecting mind as singularly strange, that the terms which the popular churches are constrained to make use of in the expression of their theory of the death of Christ, have no place in the Bible. The churches, even the Protestant churches, are so sensibly alive to this fact, that they dare not trust the Bible any more than the Romanists, without the accompaniment of notes and comments, Catechisms, and Articles of Faith, either expressed or understood. *These* express the popular faith "in the words which man's wisdom teacheth,"—the words "which the Holy Ghost teacheth" are not found sufficiently clear and definite for the creed-instilling purpose. Now, we cannot express our theory of the death of Christ in more appropriate and definite language than the language of Scripture; and if we put our ideas into other language, it is merely to indicate our theory, which would be less likely to be understood if we employed Scripture language, because of the conventional meaning which the prevalence of the popular theology has succeeded in attaching to that language. Our theory does not need the popular *expiation—satisfaction—vicarious sacrifice—the sinner's substitute—imputed merits—faith in the merits of Christ—imputed righteousness*, and others which might be named; we can do without them—we should rather say, we cannot do with them; and it is very satisfactory, at least to ourselves, that the Bible can, and does, dispense with them also.

We have said that a considerable number of *facts* connected with the tragedy of the crucifixion cannot be made to consist with the popular theory of the death of Christ. If we must accept both, we are constrained, by the stern logic of common sense, to infer the most astounding and even impious conclusions. This must be apparent. For example:

It is affirmed that the death of the Lord Jesus Christ gave to God a *satisfaction for sins.*

Then it follows, in the view of the facts which have come under our consideration, that as *Satan* was the prime instigator of that deed, *Satan must have given the satisfaction.*

It is maintained that *the justice of God was maintained and magnified* by the death of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Then it follows, from the New Testament representations of the causes of Christ's death, that God's justice was maintained and magnified by the *highest injustice and wickedness of men!*

It is affirmed that the death of Christ *cleansed judicially the world's guilt, and is the reason why God forgives sin.*

Then it follows, from the Scriptural history of the Cross, that *the world's guilt was purified by the foulest guilt which the world ever perpetrated;* and that the *greatest sin* which was ever committed is *the reasonable cause why God should forgive all other sins!*

Marvellous conclusions! strangely at variance with every moral sentiment of our bosoms: but yet sternly and logically true, if we must accept the popular and so-called "orthodox" theory, along with the representations which the New Testament gives of the death of Christ—representations which most evidently set forth that solemn event as an unprecedented act of wickedness—the joint accomplishment of the arch-spirit of evil, and the apostate sons of men.

We are aware that in thus following our subject to legitimate issues, we are stepping beyond the limits of that liberty which orthodoxy licenses. Popular Christianity prohibits reasoning, unless it consents to revolve in its own recognized circle. In bar of any hostile conclusions, though never so logical, it steps in and demurely deprecates the "pride of reason," "leaning to one's own understanding," and so forth. Although itself abounding in argumentation of a kind, even sinking under the oppressive weight of its many speculations, it lifts up itself in angry impatience, and denounces, in true sacerdotal style, all logic but its own. We hear the protest from many a popular pulpit and priest-ridden people—already the thunder-tones of an intolerant orthodoxy fall on our ears, telling us that our reason is rebellion—that our logic is the veriest licentiousness—a lever lent us by the pow-

ers of darkness to do a work worthy of the arch-demon himself. But wrath and raillery are not reason. Hard names and withering denunciations do not necessarily come from the "heavenly places." Abuse is not argument; and condemnations may come from other than Christian lips. Such have always been the ill-deserts of those who will dare to confront favorite theories with the facts and principles of the Bible; and we hope for grace and patience to enable us to bear our part of the great penalty which all truth-witnesses in this world must calculate on. "The servant is not greater than his lord." This hackneyed habit of deprecating and denouncing reasoning is only indulged in when reasoning resists the popular conclusions. It is only *hostile* reasoning that is heretical. Reason may run riot, if she will consent to be reeled at last into the place that orthodoxy has assigned her: but if clear-sighted, calm and Christian, she will obey only her own higher dictate—then even the religious will unite with the rabble to rail at her integrity. You must not reason at all, say some. You may reason, say others, if you will consent to do so by our religious rule. We have abundant illustrations of this last class, in the history of sectarian intolerance, and the *odium theologicum* of religious controversy; and the political theologian before alluded to, is an example of the former. A curious example, too; for while he tells us that "we must not presume to sit in judgment on such an act" as the crucifixion of our Lord, he himself presumes to do this very thing, and asks, with singular inconsistency, the question, "Could that be a *crime* which secured for all mankind eternal joy?"—a question, be it observed, arising out of his own *logal* conclusion from the premises which, in common with the so-called orthodox, he accepts as Scripturally true. The obvious truth is, that men will and must reason—that their Creator has constituted them reflective and rational beings, and bidden them, by the necessity of their constitution, to exercise their reasoning faculties. And we may be sure, that that is not the true, but a false religion, which rebukes the exercise of reason, and treats it as a renegade and enemy to the truth. Truth ever assumes the dignified attitude of the great Apostle to the Gentiles, and says with him, "I speak as unto wise men, *judge* ye what I say." If the judgments of men differ in reference to any principle, or fact—if the individual reason of two or more men, guided by a profound reverence for the revelations of the Bible, shall constrain contrary conclusions, then it is both wise and Christian to compare notes—not to curse and condemn one another. A candid comparison of premises will often lead to the detection of the causes of difference, and secure ultimately a common consent. The conclusion of Mr. D'Israeli differs from our own. There is no fault in his logic, any more than we believe there is no fault in our own. But our *premises* differ. He accepts the popular or "orthodox" opinions concerning the death of Christ. He believes that the Almighty Father required that Jesus should suffer as he did, on the cross, for great purposes connected with his moral government of his creatures, as well as for the sake of enabling him to be gracious to them, consistently with certain supposed perfections. Believing this, he naturally reasons that the Jews were doing a necessary, honorable, and highly beneficial work in putting Jesus to death; and therefore he asks—"Could that be a *crime* which secured for all mankind eternal joy?" &c. He does not appear to be mindful of the moral light in which the sacred writers have exhibited the conduct of the Jews in crucifying Christ. With them he appears unconsciously to differ. They, as we have seen, denounce it as the climax of all crime. All believers in the Bible will readily allow, with his reviewer, that Mr. D'Israeli must be wrong in his conclusions. Would that they saw the real ground of his serious mistake! His reasoning is right, but his *religion* is wrong. God did not require the crucifixion of his Son. His government was *not* supported and strengthened, but set at naught, by that act of the Jews. God did not need that the people of Israel should *commit another and greater crime*, in order that he might forgive them their previous crimes, and furnish a moral justification for the forgiveness of the crimes of all mankind. These and their kindred dogmas belong to the corrupted Christianity of the churches, not to the genuine Christianity of the New-Testament. Mr. D'Israeli believes them, however, hence he is logically led into a great error. The popular and self-styled orthodox churches, believe with Mr. D'Israeli, but with less candor or courage than he, they rein in their reason; or else, pained and perplexed by their reflections, seek refuge in that ignoble and dangerous recommendation,—"Men must not presume to sit in judgment on such an act. They must bow their heads in awe and astonishment, and trembling gratitude." False and fatal submission! but a seeming sanctity, which in reality is an act of suicide—a laying violent hands on one's own mental and moral constitution. The unnatural tyranny, if supportable, must involve serious loss. If, as is often the case, it proves insupportable, and the laws of the intellectual and moral being will assert their resisted but rightful sway, then the recoil is commonly a precipitation of the violated manhood, into the deep dreary gulf of a hopeless infidelity. God and his Christ are dishonored by both results—for an irrational reverence, as well as a blind infidelity, must be alike offensive to him who asks from all his intelligent creatures the undivided homage of the understanding and the heart.

(*To be Continued.*)

HUMAN MATERIALISM.

WHAT THINKS?

"It has appeared to us, that the very first axiom of our science (Phrenology) is erroneous. 'The brain is the organ of the mind.' Mr. Combe states —'We do not in this life know mind as one entity and body as another, but we are acquainted only with the compound existence of *mind* and *body*, which act constantly together, and are so intimately connected, that every state of the *mind* involves a corresponding state of corporeal organs, and every state of those organs involves a certain condition of the mind.'

A similar doctrine we shall find inculcated by almost all writers on Cerebral Physiology.

This is mere *assumption.* We boast that our science is purely inductive, and yet in the enumeration of our axioms, we assume a position all our facts tend to disprove. To evade the charge of materialism, we content ourselves with stating that the immaterial makes use of the material to show

forth its powers. What is the result of this? We have the man of theory and believer in spiritualism, quarreling with the man of fact, and supporter of material doctrines. We have two parties: the one asserting that man possesses a spirit superadded to, but not inherent in brain—added to it, yet having no connection with it—producing material changes, yet immaterial—destitute of any of the known qualities of matter—in fact, an *immaterial* something, which in one word signifies *nothing*, producing all the cerebral functions of man, yet not localized, not susceptible of proof; the other party contending that the belief in spiritualism fetters and ties down physiological investigation—that man's intellect is prostrated by the domination of metaphysical speculation—that we have no evidence of the existence of an essence, and that organized matter is all that is requisite to produce the multitudinous manifestations of human and brute cerebration.—pp. 293, 294.

Almost all physiologists commence their investigations with an unfavorable bias. How is this? Because they first adopt a theory, and then commence their investigations; instead of first taking a wide and extended view of human and comparative physiology, apart from preconceived opinions; because in their infancy they were taught that man's position depended on the possession of some essence; and in their manhood, that intellect which should investigate the grounds for such a belief, is cabin'd, cribb'd, confin'd, by the apparent necessity for such a speculation. Is it necessary to prove this? Consult physiological writers, and we find they are perfectly satisfied that the seat o f mental operation is the brain, and no other organ; yet they contend that nothing more has been proved than this—that the brain, by its peculiar organism, is the instrument by which the mind acts. They introduce us to a phantom—they call forth a spirit, and without the shadow of a proof, state, it guards, governs, and directs material movements.—pp. 294, 295.

The 'why or how' such a form of matter (brain) is capable of manifesting such peculiar functions, we cannot explain: it is sufficient for our purpose to decide that it does so—we may never go further. Does any one doubt the power of matter to do this? (to evolve feeling, intelligence, &c.) To such an one we would say, who dares assign limits to the inherent powers of matter? Let us first find out all that matter *can do*, before we dogmatize and assert what it *cannot do*. p. 295.

We would ask those who are still doubtful, whether by means of intellect they gain a knowledge of the existence of anything independent of matter? We would ask them whether they can picture to the imagination 'the mind' of man apart from the organism composing man? If they cannot do this, we say, why make man an exception to the invariable law of nature? Why, in ascending link by link, the chain of organic life, add an indefinable something to the last link, which it was found unnecessary to call to our aid in the preceding? Witness the unrelenting and savage cruelty of one tribe; the fidelity and tameness of another; the sagacity, gentleness, and intellectual manifestations of a third; contrast all these with the characteristics of man, and explain, if possible, why we have recourse to theory? Why, in jumping from the sagacious monkey to man, are we to have recourse to the stimulus of an essence for explaining the superior cerebration he manifests? Why not give a portion of this or some similar essence to the monkey, because his cerebration is superior to the sheep's or goat's? Nay, why not allow a minute portion of some more impoverished essence to the fish, which obeys the call of its feeder, and swims to the required spot for its daily nourishment? If this be ridiculous—if no addition be requisite to account for the improved cerebration of inferior beings—why, without the slightest evidence, are we to suppose that a higher order of cerebration in man cannot be manifested without such an addition?

It is this conjectural doctrine—this belief in the individual and indivisible essence of mind—this love of the marvellous—this thirsting after something mysterious—which is retarding the progress of cerebral physiology, and in the same ratio, the happiness of man. It is this clinging to old opinions—this disinclination to shake off old garments, which is the cause of so much doubt concerning a question so self-evident. We oppose this system by the antagonism of *Reason* and *Nature*. It is impossible any longer to countenance the opinion. It must be rooted up. It is like a malignant disease: which can only be cured by extermination. Let it be boldly affirmed, because it is true, that as philosophers we have to deal simply and exclusively with matter. Man neither possesses, nor does he need the possession of any other stimulus than which is given to the simplest of organized beings; to the highest and most complicated, there is nothing more than a gradual addition of parts, accompanied by concentration. pp. 297, 298.

The brain of the most profound philosopher—the brains of Bacon and Newton—of Shakspeare and Byron, during their formation, assumed for a short time the peculiar form of the same organ in inferior beings."—*Dr. Engledue, in Phrenological Journal, Vol. 5, New Series, pp.* 300, 301.

MATERIALISM.

"Some men noted for acuteness and talent, have affirmed, that what is called mind is not an immaterial principle, but that its manifestations are the result of a peculiar combination of material substances endowed with what is called life, which also they have said, results from certain material influence. Such an announcement instantly brings down upon the devoted head, the execrations of religious feeling, and the thunders of the church; the unfortunate philosopher is denounced as a heathen, an infidel, and so forth. Now, I would have you reflect in this manner, believing you to be a Christian; Jesus Christ himself never uttered a reproachful word. He exhorted his followers not to rail at their neighbors, even though they should rail at them. He denounced and reproached hypocrisy, but never the expression of a mere opinion. He strove to reclaim men from the errors of their ways, and knew well that reviling was not the way to effect that important end. If, then, any one should broach to you the opinion (for it is no more) that mind is nothing but a modification of matter, put the question, what is matter, a modification you speak of? The instant this question is pronounced, you perceive the utter impossibility of answering it. All the multitudes of chemical discoveries have not yet opened, even to imagination, a hope that what matter is can ever be known to man.

We may feel an eagerness to dive into the mys-

teries of creation; but we may rest assured that whatever power is denied to us, is denied to us because it is for our good. Now, we are altogether ignorant of what mind may be, as well as matter; and the materialist could equally puzzle us by putting the question, what is mind? It is inferred, but erroneously, that if the opinion of the materialist be correct, it would impugn the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. I say erroneously, because it is obvious that nothing is impossible to God. If it has pleased Him to form body and soul of what we call by the imaginary term matter, what is that to us? He made both soul and body, and he can destroy them both. He can kill and make alive again; and this whether the materialist be right or wrong in his conjecture. Although the body is formed to die: although we should even suppose the soul dies with it, though they may be reduced to dust, or dispersed into dust, or dispersed in smoke, who will dare say that the power of God cannot reunite them at his own good pleasure, and not only restore their former union, but improve their nature, so that while the condition of former existence is not forgotten, they shall be fitted for that new sphere of enjoyment reserved for the just when made perfect? Thus we perceive that the opinion of the materialist is of no consequence whatever. But suppose that a man's mind shall be in such a condition, as to give such an opinion the hold of belief. Suppose that this belief should lead to the idea that death is annihilation; we ought not to use harsh expressions or severity against him who may be so unhappy as to be reduced to such a state of mind. It is more fitting that Christians should mildly exert themselves to convince him of error, than violently to abuse him, and treat him as an outcast. Any man or set of men holding certain opinions contrary to our own, can inflict no injury upon us. If we should feel offended, and desire to wreak vengeance on our brother, who differs from us in opinion, we are guilty of abusing our faculties, as I propose afterwards to point out, when submitting to you what may be called their legitimate and illegitimate exercise. If one man has a right to judge and form an opinion, every other man has the same undoubted right."—*Sir George Mackenzie's "Observations on the Principles of Education."* 1836.

LONGING AFTER IMMORTALITY.

THE fact that the most of men have a disinclination to fall back into the non-being whence they came, and an anxiety to live forever, is considered, in many quarters, proof positive that the Creator has determined they shall exist on like himself, through the eyles of eternity. The following is the shape in which this argument lately met our eye: "The longing after immortality which is born with us, would seem to be the prophecy and assurance of our deathlessness, the foreshadowing of the soul's prolonged and indefinite continuance, the revelation of its triumph over the change which wears the semblance of destruction." And thus philosophers and poets have triumphantly asked—If man is not the heir of everlasting existence—

"Whence this pleasing hope, this fond desire,
This longing after immortality."

Whatever value such reasoning may possess, as regards eloquence and poetry, it is, we apprehend, strikingly deficient as an argument when put to the test of sound logic and common sense. It is founded on the assumption that all men *are* what they wish to be, or that they will ultimately obtain what they desire to possess—an assumption so obviously false, that a moment's reflection must discover its absurdity. As a general rule, young men desire to arrive at a good old age, yet how many of them are laid prostrate in the dust, ere they reach the meridian of life!

Moreover, the object of this general desire is not immortality simply, or endlessness of being, considered by itself, but an immortality conjoined with happiness. So that the argument, therefore, if sound, would not only prove all men, independent of their character, to be immortal, it would also demonstrate them to be equally the heirs of perpetual bliss—a conclusion, we presume, which few who employ the argument in question, are prepared to accept.

Still the inquiry presents itself—"Why has God implanted in man this strong desire for everlasting being?" "Whence this natural aversion from non-existence?" At unaided reason we might long ask the question in vain; the Bible alone can return a satisfactory reply. That oracle discloses to us the glorious fact, that the beneficent Creator has placed before men the transcendent prize of immortal being, associated with "glory, honor, and peace," and suspended its final reception on the possession of faith in Christ, and a life of obedience to His will in this stage of existence. It seems wise, then, to declare our Heavenly Father has kindled "this longing after immortality" within us, to excite us to such a course of conduct as shall secure that inestimable blessing, which he so kindly desires to bestow. Here we find the blessed Lord commanding the Jews to "labor, not for the meat that perisheth, but for that which endures unto everlasting life;" hence, also, we read, in Romans 2: 7, of those who "by patient continuance in well-doing, sought for glory, and honor, and immortality." Our "longing after immortality," therefore, is to be regarded as no proof that we shall live forever; it is, however, another evidence of the goodness of God, —of his intense desire that we should become the heirs of eternal being.

"If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if, through the Spirit, ye do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live."—*Expositor of Life and Immortality.*

SPIRIT RAPPING.—We are indebted to Dr. Lees of England, for the following item:

Mr. G. E. Lewes has published an amusing account of a *seance* with the "rapping" lady now in London, in the course of which the "spirits" were entrapped into saying that the ghost of Hamlet's father and Semiramis, had seventeen noses; that Pontius Pilate was a leading tragedian, and that one of the *Eumenides* died six years ago, aged twenty-five, leaving six children! Indeed, the only correct reply received, was one which declared the "Medium" to be an *impostor!* Mr. Lewes' hypothesis is, that the Medium guesses according to the indications the experimentalizer gives, and only guesses right when you give right indications.

Dr. Lees, of England, called at our office in our absence West. We felt a deep disappointment in not seeing him, and hope he will favor us with a visit before his return to England. We would drop him a line, if we knew where it would find him.

The following notice from the English "*Journal of Sacred Literature Advertizer*," he left at our office, and we give it a place in the *Examiner* as an interesting item of information:

Published by W. E. Painter, 342 Strand; *Second Edition, enlarged, 3 vols., cloth 24s.:* Faber's Sacred Calendar of Prophecy. By the *Rev. G. Stanley Faber, B. D.*, Sherburn Hospital.

The anticipation of the revival of the French Emperorship, originally made from facts combined with chronology in 1818, and repeated in 1828 and 1844, pervades the whole of the Sacred Calendar, and confirms the correctness of Mr. Faber's views.

To the Publisher:

"Sir—I cannot help thinking that the circulation of the cheap edition of Mr. Stanley Faber's Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, published by you in 1844, would be very considerably extended, if, in *connection with it*, the attention of the public were directed to the recent extraordinary events in France. The portion of the work to which I specially refer is that contained in vol. 3, p. 102–130.

"All the six first heads of the symbolical Roman Wild Beast having fallen, as history attests, in the year 1806, Mr. Faber stated in his Sacred Calendar more than twenty years ago, when it was *originally* published, and *again* in its republication by yourself in the year 1844, that the rise of the seventh head must be looked for, either in the year 1806 or very shortly before it. On this principle of interpreting prophecy through the testimony of history, Mr. Faber pronounced that the Franco-Roman Emperorship, or the Emperorship of the French, must inevitably be the predicted seventh head of the great Roman symbol. Nor was his opinion built upon the necessity of historical chronology alone, it was also built upon circumstantial evidence.

"The characteristics of the seventh head are three:—1. Shortness of continuance. 2. Death by the sword of violence. And 3. Subsequent revival or restoration to political life. The two first of these characteristics had been fulfilled when Mr. Faber wrote—namely, shortness of continuance, to wit, only eleven years, from A. D. 1804, to A. D., 1815; and political death by the sword in the latter of these years at Waterloo.

"The third characteristic was not *then* fulfilled. Mr. Faber could only, if his premises were just, *expect* its fulfilment. This he certainly *did*, as he made no scruple of *declaring*, in the year 1827, or twenty-five years ago, and again in the year 1844, or eight years ago.

"But it is pretty evident that this third characteristic is even now in the progress of fulfilment: for, though the style of *Emperor of the French and King of Rome*, has not yet been *formally* adopted, the substance of Empire is now possessed, and in all human probability the *style* will shortly follow.

"It is a matter of great political importance when viewed in the light of prophecy. Under the revived seventh head, the divided Roman Empire, we are told, will go into perdition, or will be utterly destroyed; and the prophetic time assigned for this destruction is the close of the period of 1260 years. That period commenced, as there is reason to believe, A. D., 604–606. Therefore, on such a supposition, it will expire A. D., 1864–1866.

"Should the present revolution in France go on to the assumption of the French Emperorship of the first Napoleon, Mr. Faber's interpretation will be established by something not far short of mathematical demonstration.—*An Observer of the Times.*"

—o—

From Dr. Wm. K. Everson.

Springboro, Ohio.

Br. Storrs:—I bless God and feel glad that you attended that Convention at Hartford. The result, as far as you have reported it, encourages my soul, for when I beheld the bold front of Infidelity, and examined its apparent proportions, and the depth of its influence through Spirit Manifestations, and beheld the flimsy character of the material with which the church proposes to build a barrier against it, I must say, I feared the result to the Bible, with many. Not that its truths would be impaired thereby, but that the minds of many would be darkened by the striking coincidence of opinion on many subjects, held by Churchmen and Infidels; and that if the former be true, then the latter have the pith of the argument against the Churchmen, and the Bible suffers as a consequence of false constructions and false admissions; but now that that Convention has resulted in good, I know, and feel thankful for the fact.

I am called an infidel, here, by nominal professors who think to hide their own deformity by calling attention to me—like Alcibiades, who cut off his dog's tail and sent him howling through the streets, to divert public attention from himself—when, in fact, it is an almost daily business with me to argue for and defend the Bible, in all public or private places, against professed infidels, (and we have some of a very intelligent kind here,) while Churchmen skulk away, or stand and hear their Bible defamed, its truths scandalized, and their God blasphemed, without one reproof of any kind, like dumb dogs. "Nero fiddled while Rome fell;" and Napoleon ordered the gilding of the domes of Paris, that his inglorious defeat might be lost sight of, while the citizens were gazing upon the false splendor he had created; but history notes facts, and the future reveals judgment.

—o—

An Aged Believer.—The writer of the following note is an old Methodist, and till recently, has lived in the belief of the immortal soul theory: but now his eyes and heart are open to the truth. We suppress his name and residence, as he did not expect his note to be made public, we presume. He says:

"I put a $20 bill in this letter, to help you in publishing the good word of Eternal Life, in and through the merits of Jesus Christ. I wish for eternal life in and through his merits. I am now more than *ninety* years old. I was born June 7th, 1763, and now live near D—— C——. I take the Bible Examiner with him. I know according to

nature, I cannot live here much longer. I think that when I die, after death I shall not know any more than I did before I existed, until the Resurrection, if it should be a million of years. I think that time would be no longer to me, than it would to any one that will die but one minute before the resurrection. I am yours, respectfully."

May God bless and keep thee, dear old pilgrim, to Life Eternal, through His Son Jesus Christ, our Lord and Life-Giver. Soon will Jesus return *from* heaven to change our vile body: then may you have a part *in the glory.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, OCTOBER, 1853.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—Two numbers more complete the present volume. By this time, in our history, we presume it is understood that we act on the principle of "*payment always in advance:*" hence, when the volume ends, for which payment is made, our rule is to *discontinue* sending to those who have not paid in advance for *the next volume.* This rule is adhered to except in rare instances; and no one should expect they are among these exceptions unless they have specially communicated with us on the subject. Our course in this respect saves us disappointment, and our patrons the mortification of a *dun*, which is never pleasant.

Shall the Examiner be published *twice* each month the coming year? This question must be answered by our friends. If *one thousand* dollars are paid for that object by the 25th of December, we shall go forward with it twice each month, without increasing the present price of the paper. This sum can be raised if each of our present subscribers will pay *their dollar* and give us half as many more. To make sure the work, let each subscriber try to send us one new one, with his own subscription, and we think the work will be done. Those who pay one dollar for the next volume, before Dec. 25th, if we do not go on twice a month next year we will send them one copy of the new work by Br. Blain —"*Death not Life*"—*without charge;* they paying the postage on it. The general character and object of the Examiner will not be changed; but none need expect we shall surrender our independence, as an editor, to please any one, or to get or keep subscribers. We are neither anxious to continue an editor nor to have "popularity." We are quite certain we have been influenced by no such motives heretofore. If we have any notoriety hitherto, we have not sought it; but we have striven to do what we believed faithfulness to God and his truth required of us. If it please God we go into obscurity, we shall cheerfully retire; but we intend, through grace, it shall not be for unchristian conduct and uncharitableness on our part. He who cannot as cheerfully be sacrificed for the truth's sake as honored and promoted, is not worthy to be an instrument in the cause of truth. Be it as it may, we will not surrender our independence to any man or body of men. The freedom of thought, and expression of thought, we will maintain for ourself and concede to others. In love we hope ever to express ourself, and we ask others to do the same to us. Sectarian exclusiveness we abhor; and that is such exclusiveness which makes a matter of *opinion* a ground of Christian love. The Examiner cannot be prostituted to any such course while we have the same convictions of Christian charity that we now possess. We are not indifferent as to what opinions are held by our fellow-christians; yet we do not feel called upon to fall upon every opinion that may be advanced contrary to what we think is truth, as if we were the only one on earth with whom wisdom dwelt. Such a course, to us, is disgusting in the extreme.

We design to keep on the course, in this matter, that we have hitherto traveled; hoping to improve in Christian forbearance and love. Shall we be sustained in it? Let us hear from all, soon, who intend we shall be.

Our proposition is this—If we receive one thousand dollars by Dec. 25th, from subscribers or otherwise, we will publish the Examiner twice per month at $1 per year. Or, if fifteen hundred paying subscribers are secured by January first, at $2 each per year, then we will publish it weekly. If neither of these propositions are met we shall go on *monthly* as heretofore. The Examiner has been better sustained the year past than ever before; for which our friends have our thanks; and we hope to give them a *semi-monthly* next year.

—o—

TOUR WEST.—We left New York Wednesday morning, Aug. 24, by the New York & Erie Railroad, for Buffalo; four hundred miles by that route; and expected to reach there in time to take the steamer for Detroit, Michigan, the same evening, as we were promised: but, by some unaccountable delays, when there seemed no cause for them, we did not reach Buffalo till half-past ten at night—two hours behind time—and the steamer had left, so we must remain till the next evening—or near twenty-four hours—thus compelling us to fail of reaching our appointment for the first evening. Thursday we spent at the house of Br. Clark in Buffalo, where we made our home during our second course of Lectures in that city last spring. He stands firm

in "the faith once delivered to the saints," but has been compelled to withdraw from the "*Free* Baptist Church"—of which he was deacon—because he would not hold his peace on the subject of "Life *only* through Christ." The minister, after organizing that church, some two or three years since, on the avowedly *free* principle, found he was *bound* to see that such views as Br. Clark held should not become the faith of the church; for if he did allow it the "*Free*" [*bound*] "Baptist Connection" would cast him and the church out of the synagogue; so Br. Clark was requested to withdraw "*to save trouble*"—and he did withdraw. Then they gave him a vote of *thanks* for his "*Christian spirit*" in leaving them without subjecting them to the feared censure of the aforesaid *free-bound* connection. So Br. Clark has a "Christian spirit"—they being judges; if so, they who wished him to leave have manifested that they do not possess such a spirit, and that their profession of being a "*Free*" church is mere hypocricy—a name to catch free men. But we leave them to the final Judge. Br. Clark, we dare say, will feel freer now than before. Let our brethren everywhere beware of all these sectarian names, and human invented "*Covenants.*" In every place, where there are two or three, meet together to comfort and exhort one another, and pray with and for each other, but beware that no cords save the Bible and Love *bind* you. Let the utmost freedom be enjoyed for all to express their views, however they differ from one another, only that all such expressions should be in the spirit of charity, i. e., *Love.* "Forbearing one another in love" is the apostolic injunction; and it must be heeded or there is an end to Christian liberty. As to these "*settled* ministers" we have no faith that God ever designed such a class of men in his church. The tendency of it is to *lordship* over the church and the crushing of the gifts of the body of the church. If men think themselves called to preach, let them "*go forth* bearing the precious seed," and not hive themselves up till they become so narrow as to think there is nowhere else for them to live or preach; for, when this is the case, fences and bars will be necessary to bind the church, somehow, lest the *minister* be jostled out of his snug bed; and then "Br. Clark," or some one else, must go out of the church to save the "*settled* minister." Pity *such* ministers were not all pushed along into some other field, where a little hard work would cure them of their love of ease and popularity. But we will not pursue this topic further now.

Thursday evening at ten o'clock, we left Buffalo, in the "*Buckeye State*," and launched away upon the broad waters of Lake Erie. The waters were calm till after midnight, then we had a "stiff breeze," but a clear sky. At daylight we found ourself in the midst of the lake, with no land in sight, and none appeared till near noon. At length we entered the Detroit river, with Queen Victoria's dominions on our right and "Brother Jonathan's" on our left; passing up the river twenty-two miles we arrived at Detroit. Here we were compelled to remain over Friday night. At 8 o'clock Saturday morning we left for Buchanan—196 miles west of Detroit—by railroad, and at four o'clock, P. M., arrived at our destination; found a larger number of friends waiting for us than we expected to see.—They had been disappointed by our detention at Buffalo; but the time had been well occupied by Br. D. M. Mansfield and his beloved wife. We commenced immediately, the same evening, to proclaim the glorious truth of "*Life only through Christ.*" On the Sabbath we had a very large assembly; some of whom came 40 or 50 miles to hear; and we gave them three discourses, embracing about four hours in all. Before us sat an intelligent and deeply attentive audience, who, we trust, were blessed in the proclamation made. A deep interest is manifest in that place, and they showed it by furnishing themselves with books to quite a large amount, especially the "*Bible vs. Tradition.*"

We continued at Buchanan till Wednesday; then left for South Bend, Indiana, in company with our much loved Br. A. N. Seymour, who was with us during the meeting, and helped us much. We are sorry that his health and that of his beloved wife is so poor. They have labored hard, and long, but seem to be almost worn out by their labors.

Our visit at Buchanan was one of much interest and satisfaction. They helped us on our way liberally. From there we had a most delightful ride, in a "two-horse wagon," across wide-spread prairies, sixteen miles, to South Bend. Here also we received a hearty welcome, and met with many old friends whose faces we had never seen before; but their *names* were familiar to us as subscribers to the Examiner. It was truly refreshing to see them and grasp the friendly hand, and have communion of hearts by sight and words. Sweet were the days we spent in their company, and painful to part with them, but from the hope that ere long "*we shall meet again*" in our Father's kingdom.

We gave nine Lectures at South Bend, and Br. N. M. Catlin three, during the meeting. Br. Catlin formerly resided in Indiana, but for four years past at Smith's Basin, Washington Co., N. Y. He longs to be in the West again, but is at present prevented from going there through the care of his

aged father in New York. Br. Catlin's whole soul is in the work, and we hope his ardent desires to spread the truth may have a wide field.

At South Bend we also met our beloved fellow-laborer, E. Miller, Jr. Long had we been conversant, on paper, with his efficient labors in the West; but now for the first time we met him face to face. The interview, to us, was one of much pleasure and satisfaction; and the cheering account he gave us of the rise and progress of the *Life theme* in the West made us feel to "thank God and take courage." This glorious theme has been onward against all opposition, till many strong men and women, in the West, have been raised up, of God, who are able to meet any and all who may choose to come to the rescue of the fallen Dagon—immortal-soulism and endless torment. We do praise the Lord for these men and women; who by their thorough study of the Bible and the sound common sense with which they are endowed, are enabled to meet, convince, or confound all the *would-be* wise ones, whether ministers or laymen, who try to prop up that system which has so long dishonored God and given the lie to his truth. Yes, those who attempt to prop up the old natural immortality theory and endless torture, to use the language of Job, "*talk wickedly for God:*" Job 13:7. We trust they do so, "*Ignorantly in unbelief:*" though, for some, *facts* forbid our *charity* to make even this apology; nevertheless, we leave them to the judgment of God.

The friends at South Bend, and those gathered to our meeting there, manifested the same liberality, in helping us on our way, as did those at Buchanan. May the Lord abundantly reward them all.

We left South Bend by railroad for Middlebury, Ind., the residence of Br. Miller, some thirty-five miles from our last place of labor. We were met at the cars by Br. L. W. Beach—a familiar name on our list of subscribers—who carried us to his residence, some three miles from railroad. He gave us a most interesting account of the conversion of himself and wife to the faith of Life only through Christ. In their case we felt to praise God that he ever enabled us to issue the "*Six Sermons*," which found the way to their habitation, several years ago, and led them to "search the Scriptures" to see if these things were so. The result was, their thorough conviction of the truth and their open advocacy of the same. Not long after Br. E. Miller, Jr., traveled through that region confirming their faith, and adding many to the same. We found a strong company in that place; among whom Br. Miller lives, but travels extensively abroad.

At Middlebury we preached seven times to good and deeply attentive audiences; some of whom had come from thirty to sixty miles to be with us at the meeting. It was good to be there, and we trust not in vain. Here also we were helped on our way liberally. The Lord reward them.

Monday, Sept. 12th, we left those beloved ones, and set our face towards the East. We had preached over twenty times—in fifteen days—from one hour to near two each time. We were sustained in speaking above all we expected; and though often weary we did not faint till we had accomplished the mission on which we went out. Thanks be to the God and Father of our Lord and *Life-Giver*, Jesus the Messiah, for his mercy to us: and thanks be to all those dear brethren and sisters who helped us by their sympathy and prayers. They stand before the eye of our mind now, and we should be glad to mention all their names individually; but the mere mention, unless we could also give some of the thoughts of affection and satisfaction that fills our heart would perhaps not be expedient. They may be assured we remember them, as we doubt not they do us, with sincere desires and prayers that we may all meet in Life Eternal at the return of our Lord from heaven.

After various delays and vexations on the road, we arrived at home Wednesday eve; having traveled, in all, during our absence, about two thousand miles—twice crossing Lake Erie, 250 miles long. Our family we found in health and peace. The Lord be praised for all his kindness and mercy to us and ours in his watchful providence over us.

We are satisfied that the cause we advocate is advancing in the Western States, and nothing, we think, can prevent its onward march. Much more labor is needed there, and on all sides. But where can we find men to labor? and who will sustain them in it? The work *must* be done: there is no time to sleep.

BAPTISM.

BY THE EDITOR.

However others may misrepresent us—as some have done of late—we never spoke against baptism with *water*, as an ordinance of Christ. If those who have made the misrepresentations have done it ignorantly, they may have an excuse: if wilfully, sin lieth at their own door.

We say once for all, we believe in baptism with water, as an ordinance of Christ; but we judge not those who, like the Friends, think differently. Nor will we allow that any man has the right to judge us in this matter. The *mode*, or manner of applying water in baptism, has been the great point of strife among many professed Christians; and faith

and charity have both seemed to be, sometimes, disregarded in the controversy. From the strife on the subject, we have, for the most part, kept aloof; believing that we could better serve God and truth by devoting our energies in another direction, and satisfied to have every one answer their own convictions on the subject: nor shall we now say much, except on the *mode* or manner of applying water in the ordinance. On this topic we think we are called to say something, by the false representations that have been made of our position, in certain papers, recently. Besides, for years some of our friends have wondered why "Br. Storrs does not see that immersion is the only way to be baptized." The fact has been, we could not take that ground without doing violence to our conviction of truth; and though it has been painful to disagree on this question, with brethren we love, yet we could not act the hypocrite, and profess to be in agreement with *exclusive* immersion, when we are not, and when we found it impossible to be so, without surrendering our own judgment of truth.

On the mode of applying water in baptism, there is a difference of opinion, and much may be said on both sides of the question, or in favor of the different modes. After all that can be said, a difference will continue to exist. All we design is, to prepare the mind to acquiesce in that difference *charitably;* or to guard all against sectarianism. A sectarian spirit is contrary to love, and if we are baptized ever so orthodoxly, and have all faith, so that we could remove mountains, and speak with the tongues of men and angels, and have not charity, *i.e.*, *love*, we are nothing.

Christian Baptism with water, we regard not only as a *seal* of the Covenant of Grace, on our part, but as emblematical of PURITY. Baptism was practised for *purifying*—indicating the putting away sins. See John 3: 22–26, and 4: 1–3. Here we find Jesus and John baptizing at the same time, (though Jesus baptized not but his disciples,) and at that time "there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews, about *purifying*," manifestly relating to the two baptisms then being performed, as it appears from the fact that when our Lord "knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, he left Judea, and departed again into Galilee." These baptisms, then, or *purifications*, were performed as professions of, and indications that the people renounced and put away sin, which putting away is *essential* to remission, and must always be done before God will pardon the sinner. In vain do men look for forgiveness of sin, while they continue in sin. Thus John "preached the baptism of *repentance*, for (or, in order to,) the remission of sins." Lk. 3: 3. His great work was to call men to repent—*to reform their lives*—that they might be prepared to receive Christ when he should make his appearance; and when they professed their determinatiou thus to amend, or repent, they were baptized as an indication that they renounced and put away their sins, in order that they might receive remission, or pardon of them. So it is said, Matt. 3: 5—8, "Then went out to him Jerusalem," &c., "and were baptized of him in Jordan, *confessing their sins:*" that is, acknowledging their sins and professing to renounce them. And that they might not be deceived as to what was implied in their *confession*, John exhorts them plainly, saying, "Bring forth, therefore, fruits meet (suitable—in accordance with your confession,) for repentance." He does not leave his hearers in the dark, as to the natnre and design of his mission. He taught them that without putting away their sins they would not receive remission, nor embrace the coming Messiah, who would be too holy both in his doctrine and life, to be acceptable to those who had not truly reformed their lives.

The notion that baptism was designed to represent death and the resurrection, we do not think has any authority. But if that was its design, it alters not the force of the following remarks on the manner and mode of baptism. It was the *sign* of entering into covenant with God, and a *symbol* of being purified from sin, and renouncing it. (See our articles on the Covenants and their *Seals*, in Examiner for 1850.) The opinion that there is but one, and *only* one Scriptural mode, or manner, for baptism, we cannot subscribe to, with present light. If it be so, and we can show that one manner was certainly baptism, then we are confined to that. But if we should make it appear that sprinkling or pouring is called baptism in the Scriptures, you would think us uncharitable to say that immersion was *not* baptism.

There are three, four, or more baptisms spoken of in the New Testament, viz.: the baptism of *water*—the *Spirit*—*sufferings*—and perhaps *fire*. Of the baptism of sufferings, the Saviour speaks thus; Luke 12: 50, "But I have a baptism to be baptized with: and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!" Also he speaks of it to John and James, Matt. 20: 22, 23, "Are ye able to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? They say, We are able. And he saith to them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with," &c. This baptism is elsewhere spoken of, and is not forgotten by the disciples.

The word *baptism*, is untranslated in our Bibles, usually. It is the same word in English that it is in Greek, except it has an English termination in our translation. Some have complained that it was not translated. But, in our opinion, a uniform translation could not be given to the word without doing violence to the meaning of the Scriptures, because "diverse" modes will probably be found to have been practised, and the term *baptizo*—baptism---is used to express the act in them. We expect to be able to show, beyond a doubt, that the term was used where the thing was done by sprinkling or pouring; and hence, to have translated the word immersion in such cases, would have been false, *in fact*. We therefore say again—the translators of the Bible could not, *uniformly*, translate the word immersion; the thing was impossible. Besides, they were, themselves, divided on the subject of baptism; a part---a majority we believe---were immersionists, hence there was but one course could be pursued, *viz.*, that which they did pursue---leave the word untranslated.

That the Scriptures speak of a BAPTISM---*baptizo*---OF THE SPIRIT, all will admit. This baptism is *first* a subject of *prophecy*, and then a matter of *fact*. Let us first look at prophecy. Isa. 52: 13--15, "Behold my servant shall deal prudently, &c. As many were astonished at thee: his visage was so marred, &c. So shall he *sprinkle* many nations," &c. Here it seems clear the baptism of the Spirit is spoken of; but if any doubt it, we turn to Ezk. 36: 25--27, "Then will I *sprinkle clean water* upon you, and ye shall be clean: from

all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart will I also give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them." Can there be a doubt but that the baptism of the Spirit is here prophecied of? It may, possibly, be objected that the sprinkling with clean water is not the baptism of the Spirit, because the fact of the Spirit's being put within them is spoken of as something done afterwards. If so, the argument for baptism with water by sprinkling, is made stronger, because the clean water was to be *sprinkled* upon them *just prior* to the Spirit's being put within them: and we find that baptism with water, ordinarily, was that which immediately preceded the Spirit's being poured upon them: hence the prophecy, "I will *sprinkle clean water* upon you," would relate to that baptism with water going before that of the Spirit.

If, however, Ezekiel 36th be questioned, the prophecy of Joel cannot be evaded, Joe 2: 28, 29. "I will *pour out of my Spirit* upon all flesh, &c. Also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days, will I pour my Spirit," &c. On the day of Pentecost, Peter quotes this prophecy as having a partial fulfillment in that remarkable visitation of the Holy Spirit.

Before we proceed further, we will examine the Scriptures as to the idea of "*pouring*," &c. Amos 9: 6, it is said, "He calleth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth. The LORD is his name." Here is a clear reference to the evaporation of water from the sea, and its condensation into clouds, and then falling upon the earth in *rain*. Job saith, "Mine eye *poureth* out *tears* unto God;" Job. 16: 20. Elihu says, Job. 36: 27, 28, "For he maketh small the drops of water: they pour down rain according to the vapor thereof, which the clouds do drop and distil upon man abundantly." Here is "*pouring* down *rain*," where "*small drops*," and even "*vapor*" are "*distilled* upon man." These texts are sufficient to show in what sense *pouring* is used in the Bible; but we will add one more, Hosea 6: 3, "Then shall we know, if we follow on to know the Lord; his going forth is prepared as the morning; and he shall come unto us as the rain, as the latter and former rain unto the earth."

If we find there is a clear case in the New Testament where the term baptism---*baptizo*---is used in the sense of the texts just examined, then the question is settled that the term could not be translated immersion in that case, and that, therefore, the term baptism---*baptizo*---has not the *exclusive* sense of immersion; and, consequently, that *other mode* is as truly baptism as immersion. We may premise that it makes no difference what the person or thing is baptized *with;* if the term *baptism*, is used to express the *act*, it determines the meaning of *that term* in a certain case, and shows that if immersion is to be proved, it must be done by some other means than by an appeal to the phrase baptism---*baptizo*. We are not about to do as many have done in this controversy---hide themselves behind D. D's., Lexicons, and a great parade of learning, of which common people can judge nothing, and about which the learned differ among themselves. We will first settle this point from the English translation, so that each person can read and understand for himself; and now proceed direct to the examination of the baptism---*baptizo*---of the Spirit. Mark 1: 8, "I indeed have baptized you with water: but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." John 1: 29, 33, 34, "The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him and saith, Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. And I knew him not, but he that sent me to baptize with water, said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit of God descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record, that this is the Son of God." Here Jesus is pointed out, as he who is to baptize *with* the Holy Spirit; and it is represented that the Spirit "*descended* on him;" and Matthew says, it "descended *like a dove and lighted* upon him," not immersed him: that is, his own baptism of the Spirit was not by immersion.

In John 7: 37–39, we read thus: "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified." This last verse was John's remark on the two previous ones, and was written some fifty years after the day of Pentecost. Till the Pentecost the Spirit was not given to men in that copious manner that it had been promised. We next look at Acts 1: 4, 5, "And being assembled together with them, commanded that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me: For John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Here our Lord uses the same term---"baptized"—in relation to water and Spirit. At the eighth verse he says, "Ye shall receive power after the Holy Ghost has *come upon you;*" not after ye are immersed into it. Now we come to the *facts* of this baptism. Acts 2: 1–4, "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them: And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." This "*came from*" *above*, and the cloven tongues, as of fire, SAT *upon them.* If here is any immersion, it is entirely unlike any practised in these days. If to avoid the conviction of this account, it be said, "They were overwhelmed by the Spirit," we ask, Is that the way immersionists practise in this age? Do they put the candidate into a room, and then *pour* in water till he is "overwhelmed?" That the mode in which this baptism---*baptizo*---was accomplished, was not immersion, will further appear from verses 16–18, where Peter says: "THIS IS THAT which was spoken of by the prophet Joel---saith God, I will *pour out* of my Spirit, &c. * * On my servants, &c., I will *pour out* in those days of *my Spirit*," &c. If any doubt still remained, it is cleared away at verses 32 and 33, where Peter declares that Jesus having been "exalted, received of

the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath SHED *forth* this which ye now see and hear." If assurance needs to be made doubly sure, we will look at Acts 10: 44, 45, when Peter was at the house of Cornelius, and "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." Here, to *fall* upon, and to be *poured out* on, indicates anything but immersion: and Peter in defending himself before the church at Jerusalem, for going into the Gentiles, gives this account of the matter, chap 11: 15, 16, "As I began to speak, the Holy Ghost *fell on them* AS *on us* at the beginning:" that settles how it came on the day of Pentecost; "then," adds Peter, "remembered I *the word of the Lord*, how that he said, John indeed *baptized* WITH water, but ye shall be *baptized* WITH the Holy Ghost." How were they baptized with the Holy Spirit? It FELL upon them----it was POURED *out* upon them----it came down upon them like "*the rain*," according to the prophecy of Hosea 6: 3.

Thus we see, without any parade about "Lexicons"—"learned men"—and "Doctors" so and so, that the Scriptures plainly teach that the meaning of baptism—*baptiso*—is *not* "immersion ONLY;" and if baptism with water is to be administered in some other way than by the water being "*poured out*," or "coming upon," as rain, is "*shed*" down or "*distilled* upon man," it must be proved in some other way than by an appeal to the term *baptism*. It does not alter the case, at all, to say the baptism we have spoken of was not with *water*, but the Spirit. It is not the *element* used we are contending about—it is the *meaning* of *the term* that is expressive of *the act* done; the *act* is baptism—*baptiso*—in both cases. We have seen in one case it was *not by immersion:* let those who take the opposite ground prove that in the other case the *act* was by immersion if they can; remembering that no appeal to the term *baptism* can avail them any thing now. We admit the term may be properly employed where immersion is the act; but we contend, and have shown by the Scriptures, that that is not the *only* meaning of the term; and, therefore, they must make out their case from *circumstances* connected with the baptism, and cannot do it from *the term* that expresses the act.

Paul declares, Acts 26: 22, that in his "witnessing to both small and great" he was "saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come." We have shown that the prophets did say "*sprinkling*" and "*pouring* should come"; let the exclusive immersionists show that any of them ever said that *immersion* should come. Can they do it? Where is the testimony? No *inferences* will help them here. The Old Testament affords them no support nor countenance for immersion at all; and it is only *inferred* from the New. But on that point we may speak fully at another time if compelled to pursue the subject further than what we design in this article. We have no desire to press that point, but if driven to the subject we shall do our duty without fear. We have counted the cost and have not been asleep on the subject. We wish to kindle no strife: we would pour cold water on the burning lava that we see rolling along when the zeal of some gets kindled for immersion *exclusively*.

Hitherto we have avoided all reference to the "*original*"—because, in regard to the term baptism, there is no original: as we have said, it is untranslated with the simple addition of an English termination; but we will here give you one instance where it is rendered "*washings*," viz., Heb. 9: 10; and if it had been left untranslated as in other places, it would read "*diverse baptisms;*" and it is left "*baptisms*" chap. 6: 2, and is the same word in both places. In chap. 9, when the apostle came to speak of those "diverse baptisms," verses 13 to 21, he says: "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer SPRINKLING—*Rantizousa*—the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifiying of the flesh," &c. Turn to the case in the law spoken of, viz., Numbers 19, and you will see that those "diverse baptisms," that Paul speaks of, Heb. 9: 10, 13, were all performed by sprinkling. In further describing these "diverse washings"—*baptismois*—Paul says, verses 19 to 21, "When Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took blood of calves and of goats, with *water*, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and SPRINKLED—*Errantized*—both the book, and all the people—moreover he SPRINKLED likewise with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry." Here we have Paul using the terms *baptism* and *sprinkling* interchangeably; applying them both to THE SAME ACTS. If we needed any additional proof that immersion is not the *only* meaning of the term baptism we have it here.

We suppose now that we have said all that is necessary for the English reader, we may indulge in one remark on *the action* of baptism by immersion as performed in these days. It is always done by *dipping* or *plunging*, though they call it "*immersion*." But the term *Baptizo* does not signify *in Scripture*, to *dip* nor *plunge*. When that action is intended, *Bapto*, or some *other derivitive* than *Baptizo*, is the word employed; and the word is translated accordingly: thus John 13: 26, where our Lord was asked who it was that would betray him; he said, "He to whom I shall give a sop when I have *dipped* it"—*bapsas*, from *bapto*. "And when he had dipped—*embapsas*, from *bapto*—the sop he gave it to Judas Iscariot." Another instance is in Luke 16: 24, where the rich man wished Lazarus to "dip—*bapse*—the tip of his finger in water," &c. Again, in Rev. 19: 13, where the glorious personage on a white horse has "a vesture *dipped*"—*bebammenon*, from *bapto*—"in blood," &c. The context shows how his vesture came dipped in blood; v. 15, "He treadeth the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of the Almighty God." Compare this with Isa. 63: 1–6. "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with *dyed* garments from Bozrah? *** I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save. Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel? *** I have trodden the wine-press alone ***; their blood shall be *sprinkled* upon my garments, and I will *stain* all my raiment; for the day of vengeance is in my heart and the year of my redeemed is come," &c., to v. 6. Thus we have shown that *bapto*, or some other derivitive from it than *baptizo*—is the word used for *dip*, in the Scriptures: and that word also we have seen would not favor exclusive immersion, or plunging; for it is used to signify not only dipping, but *sprinkling* and *staining*.

We now conclude by saying—We have demonstrated from the Bible that baptism—*baptizo*—does not signify *exclusively* immersion, and that it does

sometimes signify pouring and sprinkling. But, as we have said at the outset, we do not expect to accomplish any thing more by this effort than to soften down that sectarian spirit that so often exists on this question; and which has been a great hindrance to the promotion of real godliness—which consists in *love* to one another. We concede to others their right to think that immersion is the only mode of baptism, and no other mode would answer for them; and we respect their opinion and love them none the less for it. Let this respect and love be mutual, and the hateful spirit of sectarianism, on that point, is dead. We baptize freely and cheerfully either by immersion, sprinkling, or pouring; and consult *only* the candidates' own convictions on the subject. On no other ground, we are satisfied, can harmony ever exist among Christians. Shall it still be interrupted by a *positive* spirit on either side? Shall the *strife be continued?* Who shall say—All must bow to *my opinion* or I will not acknowledge them as having any title to the kingdom of God? Such a responsibility we will neither *bear* nor *share*.

If any think us "ill at ease" on the subject of baptism, it may afford *them* some "*ease*" to know that we have no misgivings in relation to the matter: we are settled upon it, but have been willing to hear all that friends or foes could say on the question; and after looking on all sides of it we can take no other view of the subject than that presented in the foregoing remarks. We will not enter into strife with any on the question—though shamefully misrepresented by some—and we have avoided, as far as possible, all controversy on the subject, as all must bear us witness who have read the Examiner, or heard us preach: but if any undertake to make *the mode* of the ordinance a *test* of Christian character, and fitness for the kingdom, we shall take the liberty to caution Christian men and women not to be ensnared by such *sectarianism*, which will be quite as likely to exclude from the kingdom of God as a failure to see immersion as the only mode of baptism. We have said but little on the subject to what might be said; nor should we have said thus much but from a conviction of duty, and certain developments in this section of country. The long string of slanderous misrepresentations of our position, that lately appeared in certain papers, we shall not notice at present, if ever. "*Let love be without dissimulation.*"—"Love is the fulfilling of the law." Without this there may be "*sounding brass*," but there cannot be a *Christian* character.

—o—

FROM BR. C. M. RICHMOND.

Peru, Ind., Aug. 31, 1853.

Bro. Storrs:—I visited, since my last communication, Lafayette, where I spent two Sabbaths, preaching eleven times to large and attentive congregations. Much good, I trust, will be the result. But, oh! the bigotry and bitterness on the part of the orthodox churches generally!! The *candid*, however, will examine, and of such, nine out of ten will receive the truth.

The brethren wish me to labor with them one Sabbath each month, for the year to come. Bro. Hall will be in New York the last of September, and will call on you, and receive for me, if you please, some books. *Your Six Sermons*, for a cheap work, is the best thing I have seen yet. It is more sought for than any other, and does good execution. Should like about one dozen more of "*Bible vs. Tradition*," and a few of your *Miscellanies*, and a dozen of "*The Unity of Man*." I do wish we could have the *Examiner* twice a month. I shall do all I can to raise the number of subscribers requisite, and I am confident, if we all take hold in right good earnest, it can be done. It will require *exertion*—but then, the object—the advantage of having *double the amount of reading*—will more than compensate for the effort. It seems to me the truth *demands* it of us—and demands it *now*. I think it will be easier to obtain two subscribers, if published twice a month, than one at once a month.

I am now engaged in a discussion with the Methodist Episcopal Minister of this place, on the *intermediate state*, and the *penalty of the law*. I trust truth will be promoted by the effort. It is a *written* discussion, and published in the *Miami County Sentinel*. The following, I think, will be some of the advantages:

1. *Many* will read on this subject, that would not under other circumstances.

2. It will give fresh interest to the subject, throughout the county.

3. It will be seen by all, (except bigots,) that orthodoxy rests on a foundation of *sand*.

4. It will be a good discipline to myself, in preparing me to combat error.

5. It will strengthen those whose sympathies are with us, and who are honestly inquiring for the truth.

I know of several *ministers* in this State, who are examining this Life theme, and one or two who have come clear out on the truth. Eld. Hicks (*Christian preacher*, and a *good man*,) embraces these precious truths, and I think will be an efficient laborer in this cause.

The brethren in this valley are anxious to see Bro. Storrs, and hear him preach, and should you visit the West another season, they will insist upon your coming this way.

—o—

FROM RUFUS WENDELL.

Canajoharie, N. Y.

MY DEAR BROTHER:—Hailing, as I do, with delight and gratitude every effort that is put forth against the unscriptural, pagan dogma of inherent immortality, I was not a little pleased with the announcement in the *Bible Examiner* that Br. BLAIN was about to appear in the field as an author.

"*Death not Life*": a very appropriate title this. Would to God its significance were appreciated by the great mass of those professing to revere the teachings of the Bible. I am not sure but that another work, entitled "*Life not Happiness*," is needed. In conversation with a Methodist clergyman, not long since, I mentioned, as a strong objection to the endless torment theory, the fact that its advocates were *compelled* to reject the *literal* import of the term *life* in every instance where it is made the subject of promise to believers. He denied the correctness of my position, and affirmed that *life*, in such cases, meant "*happy existence*." In reply, I suggested that upon his principle *death* ("*the wages of sin*," and the antithesis of *life*) must signify, when denounced against the ungodly, *miserable* NON-*existence*. He failed to see that my deduction from his premises was a fair one.—Shortly afterwards, however, I broached the same idea again, and made this inquiry of him—"Your ground is that *life* (when the subject of promise,) denotes "*happy existence*;" this being so, do you not give the term both a *figurative* and a *literal* meaning at the same time?" Had his answer been *Yes*, I would have followed it with this query—"Must not *death* also be construed *literally* and *figuratively*? and if so, what becomes of the popular notion?" But he saw his dilemma, and gave me no direct answer. Wishing, however, to be consistent, he abandoned his absurd position, and, accepting the "orthodox" view, asserted that "happiness" *simply* was intended by the term *life*. Strange to say, this brother assents to the rule of interpretation which requires that "words be taken in their most common and obvious meaning, unless such a construction leads to absurd consequences, or be inconsistent with the known intention of the writer."

Yours, truly,

RUFUS WENDELL.

"THE BIBLE CONVENTION."—Where, friend deist, is the promised pamphlet that was to contain "*a full report* of the discussions" of that Convention at Hartford? We expressed a fear in the July Examiner that such a report would never appear; and we have now waited *four months* in vain for a sight of it. Truly, gentlemen, you are slow to give the public your *boasted* triumph. The Reporter did his work faithfully, we judge; for he sent us our speeches for examination near three months since, and we returned them to him without delay. Has the "*self-praising*" Joseph Barker done the same? or, are his speeches unreturned to this day? Does friend Barker fear that some of us are so naughty that when his speeches appear in print, we shall take his "*Christianity Triumphant*" and give a chapter of *contrast*? comparing Joseph Barker the *Christian*, with Joseph Barker the *Deist*? That we intend to do, the Lord being our helper. But do not fear the trial, friend Barker: if you have truth now it will show to good advantage in *contrast*. Do let us have the Reported Discussion before it gets as old as the *Gibeonitish bread*. We have good reason for thinking that some of the deists of that Convention have not returned their speeches. Perhaps they have not had time. We will wait longer, then.

"THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER."—The 4th and 5th numbers of this *monthly* are received. The work is "Published and Edited by Israel E. Jones, Newark, N. J." Bro. Jones says—"This periodical is designed to be a Family Preacher and a Family Physician; to give advice for the improvement and preservation of the present life, and the attainment of the life which is to come."

The work is a medium octavo of 32 pages, monthly, at 50 cents for six months; printed on good paper, with covers. Our absence from home, and the pressure of business since our return, has prevented an examination of it; but judging from a casual glance over it, think it may be a useful work.—Success to you, Br. Jones, in doing good to men for "the life that now is and that which is to come."

"THE IRISH EVANGELIST, *John Hurly*, Editor and Publisher," at 256 Bowery, New York. We have seen only one number of this paper, viz., that for August. The editor seems to be a convert *from* the Roman Catholic Church, and is laboring with commendable zeal for the conversion of his Irish Catholic brethren, with some success. May he be abundantly prosperous in advancing the truth. We were amused with the round about way "Mr. Owens" takes in the "*Talk on the Road*," to convince "*Pat*" that he "ought not *to pray to saints in heaven*." The short way would be to teach "*Pat*" that praying to dead saints is the same as to pray to wood or stone—for "*the dead know not anything*." Convince "*Pat*" of that truth and he will soon see there are no dead saints "*in heaven*" to hear prayers or intercede for him. Surely "*Pat*" is not so great a dunce as to look for gold where he *knows* there is none. The food of Roman Catholicism is the doctrine of the immortality of the soul and its survivance in consciousness after death. Deprive it of this food and it dies of itself. Now, friend Hurly, try the Scripture doctrine of *no future life without a resurrection from the dead*, and see if it does not work to a charm on the system of Papal delusion. In our opinion it will liberate more of your Irish brethren in one year than ten years' labor without. We sincerely wish Br. Hurly success in his labor, and hope he may be sustained. He needs funds to carry forward his good work. The *Evangelist* is a folio of 4 pages, monthly, at $1 per year. Let those help it who can.

THE CHILD'S FRIEND has been removed from Rochester, N. Y., to Honeoye, Ontario Co., N. Y. All communications should be directed to O. R. L. Crosier, its Editor and Publisher, accordingly.

—o—

PAULINE THEOLOGY; or, *The Christian Doctrine of Future Punishment as Taught in the Epistles of Paul.* By H. L. Hastings, Plymouth, Mass.

Such is the title of a neat pamphlet of 48 pages, 12 mo., just issued. It is an excellent work, and we hope it may be widely circulated. It is well arranged, and will carry conviction to any mind not hopelessly shut up in Pagan fables. We would like to give extracts, but cannot this month. The price we do not know, but presume it is about 12 1-2 cents. Let it be scattered widely.

—o—

AN INCIDENT.—On our way from South Bend, Ind., to Middlebury, two ladies were sitting in the cars, just before us, who had some *tracts*. A Presbyterian minister entered the cars and took his seat directly opposite the ladies. One of them handed a lady on the seat behind him the tract, "*Can you Believe?*" by Moncrieff. It was passed into the hands of the minister, who looked at it a short time and then wrote on the margin—"*Well spiced with infidelity,*" and handed it back to one of the ladies before us, who wrote—"*That is your opinion—Let God be true and every man a liar,*'" and returned it to the minister; who wrote in reply—"*Here is the spirit of the sect.*" Having written this he walked out into another car, and left, as we suppose, his wife and another lady to sit near we "*heretics*" alone, as he appeared no more, till we left the cars, having arrived at Middlebury. We must have traveled some ten or fifteen miles after he took himself out of sight. Is it true that some men "flee when no man pursueth?" A lady quoted a text of Scripture, which the minister said was "the spirit of the sect," and then fled. He doubtless dreaded an encounter with her, as she was an acquaintance of his, who had lately embraced the Life views, and had been dealt with by a Presbyterian church, for her supposed departure from the faith, on the charge of having embraced "*unscriptural doctrine;*" but when the trial came, that church would not allow her to *read the Scriptures* in her defence! The fact was, she had too much Scripture for them; and the minister in the cars having knowledge of the matter was among the missing after the first shot from the Bible. A very safe course, no doubt.

—o—

THE PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE acknowledge the receipt of the following sums during the month past, viz:

From friends in Philadelphia, by Br. Blain, $9,00
" " Lockport, N. Y. 3,00

Br. Blain has now entered upon his agency under the *Prov. Com.; Br. W. S. Campbell* has also consented to go out in this work. Br. Campbell will labor, at present, in Western Mass., and Eastern N. Y. We trust Br. J. S. White will commence his labors in a few days, under the patronage of the Prov. Com. We think he will. We hope the friends of the *Life Theme* will feel the importance and necessity of sustaining these brethren and others who may enter the field. Winter is coming on; and now is the time to put forth an effort to make advances with the truth in that season when most persons have more leisure to read, hear, and investigate than in spring or summer. Br. Richmond seems to be laboring in a promising field and with good success; yet, in new fields, like his, it is not to be expected the laborer will meet with that pecuniary aid which will be necessary to free him from care, on that score; hence the necessity of help from others who have felt the value of the truths we publish. Come, friends, as the Lord has prospered you, send in your free-will offerings to help on this work. Remember *now* is the time to work. Ears are open everywhere to hear on this topic, and let us see that the laborers be not left to "*serve tables:*" they should be sustained; nay, they *must* be. Help then, ye men and women who love the truth, and help without delay.

—o—

BOOKS, BOOKS.—We are glad to say, that the "*Bible vs. Tradition,*" continues to be called for, so that the *second* edition is almost exhausted. We sold nearly one hundred copies on our western tour; and about the same of "*Death not Life.*" No works have sold so rapidly and readily as these except the "*Six Sermons.*" Let them continue to be scattered. They are doing up the work with great power. They are mighty through God to the pulling down the strong-holds of the God-dishonoring doctrines of inherent immortality and endless torture.

Prices.—"Bible vs. Tradition," 75 cents; ten copies for $5, cash.

"Death not Life," 25 cents; six copies for $1.

—o—

APPOINTMENTS.—We design preaching as follows, for the remainder of this year.

AT DANSVILLE, Livingston Co., N. Y., the *second* and *third* Sundays in Oct., and the week intervening, each evening at least.

AT BOSTON, Mass., the *first* and *second* Sundays in Nov., and the week intervening.

AT WORCESTER, Mass., the first and second Sundays in Dec., and the week intervening.

AT PATERSON, N. J.. the last Sunday *in each* month.

During the intervals between these appointments we shall be in or about New York, attending to the business of the Examiner and the cemmunications of our friends. Our friends will bear with us if they find a little delay in filling their orders; especially if the orders arrive here after we have left for those appointments which compel us to be absent a whole week. We have none to leave our business matters with.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VIII. NEW YORK, NOVEMBER, 1853. NO. 11.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 140 Fulton-street, (Up Stairs.)

TERMS.--Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

HUMAN MATERIALISM.

MATERIALISM AND PHRENOLOGY.

"We ask at once, and without hesitation, *what*, although Phrenology did teach materialism? We have already pointed out the absurdity of an argument *a priori*, against a system claiming to be founded on facts. If it be said materialism leads to infidelity, it would be well for the speaker to consider whether the admission may not be an argument against Christianity, rather than against Phrenology. Let those who urge the cry of scepticism, examine their hearts and see whether *they* be not the true infidels, who cannot depend upon the promises of God, unless there is something in the very substance of the soul which renders its annihilation impossible! So far from giving those men credit for extra piety and evangelistic faith, who talk so loudly of the grossness of organized matter, and disclaim so earnestly about the corrupt vileness of the human body, as has been hitherto the fashion, we confess we are much more inclined to accuse them of *discontent* with the condition of existence which the Almighty has been pleased to appoint, and of blaspheming a form and a substance capable, to our sense, of a perfection and a sublimation which surpasses in its grace and nobility all that we can conceive of the disembodied spirit of modern theorists. The Christian builds *his* hopes, not upon the indestructible essence of the human soul, but upon the sure promises of the Gospel.

* * * * *

It by no means strengthens our conviction of Lord Brougham's belief in Christianity, that he has chosen to peril the doctrine of human immortality exclusively upon a rejection of that of materialism. His discourse of Natural Theology reminds us forcibly of the excellence of the proverb, *ne sutor ultra crepidam*, and proves that a great orator may be a very indifferent metaphysician. We pass over, by merely noticing his assertion, that the mind could conceive of, and reason upon, all the abstractions of numbers and mathematical problems without any notion of externality; and, retorting the proposition, by the averment, that the knowledge of their phenomena is altogether matter of experience, and is therefore least of all independent of the external world, seeing that they are inventions and discoveries confined to civilized life, and not even imagined by the ignorant and the savage. But we cannot suppress our surprise at the unskilful manner in which his Lordship avails himself of the old argument derived from consciousness. We *know*, he contends, that every particle of the human body is changed once in six or seven years; we feel assured, from the evidence of our consciousness, that our mind is the same intellect, and that we are the same entity now, that we were forty years before: the body having changed and our being conscious that the mind has not, ergo, the body is not the mind! Here his Lordship has perilled his whole case upon the infallibility of consciousness, while it is certain that we are as little conscious of any change in the body as of alteration in the identity of mind. He has also forgotten, that the transmutation which takes place in the intellect between the period of infancy and manhood, is as presumptive of a renovation of substance as the renovation of the corporeal particles. But above all, if mere identity were conclusive of spirituality, it would *prove the body was immaterial in its structure and qualities*, however gross in its substance. Although the *particles* of the body undergo a transformation, its diseases, colors, (natural and artificial, like tatooing, &c.,) shapes, peculiar susceptibilities remain permanent, fixed, unalterable. The idiosyncracies of the system are never eradicated, or changed; the marks of the same wounds (often strikingly illustrated in the hands and face of coal miners), and virulence of the same tumours exist unabated, although all the particles of which they were composed have probably been obliterated and renewed at least ten times over. Thus, the profound discovery in metaphysics, if it be available for any purpose whatever, proves that the laws of *mind and body are identical in their phenomena*, and establishes upon the very basis of the spirituality of the soul, the immateriality of the body! But forsooth, his Lordship will not admit the existence of matter, unless the independence of mind be conceded; and thus the question of immortality is argued in the style of a special pleading in the Court of Chancery. What becomes of the favorite solving apparatus of consciousness here? What would have been the sense of individuality, but for an external material world?

"When Bishop Berkeley said, there was no matter,
There was no matter what he said."

The existence of matter must be conceded, in an argument which has for its object the proof that *there is something besides*, and when that is admitted, the proof rests with the sceptic, who conceives that the intervention of some other principle is necessary to account for the phenomena presented to our experience. The hidden qualities of this substance must be detected, and its whole attributes known, before we can be warranted in *assuming the existence* of *something else* as necessary to the production of what is presented to our consciousness. And when such a principle as that of galvanism or electricity, confessedly a property of matter, can be present in, or absent from a body, attract, repel and move, without adding to, or subtracting

from the weight, heat, size, color or any other quality of a corpuscle,—it will require some better species of logic than any hitherto presented, to establish the impossibility of mind being a certain form, quality, or accessory of matter, inherent in and never separated from it. We do not argue thus because we are confident that there exists nothing but matter, for, in truth, our feeling is, that the question is involved in too much mystery, to entitle us to speak with the boldness of settled conviction on either side. But we assume this position, because we think the *onus probandi* (burden of proof) falls on the spiritualists, and that they have not established the necessity of inferring the existence of another entity besides matter,to account for all the phenomena of mind, by having failed to exhaust all the possible qualities or probable capabilities of that substance which they labor so assiduously to degrade and despise. But while they have altogether failed to establish this necessity, whereon depends their entire proposition, they have recourse to the usual expedients of unsuccessful logicians, by exciting the ignorant prejudices of bigotry, and intolerance, against all that is dignified with the name of dispassionate philosophy.

The truth is, it is time that all this fudge and cant about the doctrine of materialism, which affects the theory of immortality in no shape whatever,—as the God who appointed the end, could as easily ordain that the means might be either through the medium of matter or spirit,—should be fairly put down by men of common sense and metaphysical discrimination."—*Sidney Smith's "Principles of Phrenology,"* 1838.

MATERIALISM AND IMMATERIALISM, AND THEIR MORAL AND RELIGIOUS BEARINGS.

The extract we are about to present is long; but an intelligent reader, we apprehend, will find it worthy of deliberate consideration. To some statements in this extract, we, of course, object, because they jar with the Bible doctrine of the human soul and spirit; nevertheless, apart from these, it contains information that is valuable, and reasoning that is sound.—*Ed. of Expositor.*

"The supposed tendency of modern physiology to materialism has peculiarly alarmed Protestant divines. We are not concerned with the truth or falsehood of the opposite theories which have been advanced on this subject; but with their religious aspect. The author of this volume (Vestiges,) is a decided Materialist; but he holds that this does not in the slightest degree affect the truths of Theism, since the development of faculties whereby we suppose we surpass the brutes, is precisely that which puts us into contact with Deity. The whole subject of materialism has been so involved in verbal controversy, that we desire to try to clear off much that is extraneous.

"First, let it be observed, that if, (according to a current opinion) materialism consists in supposing that the soul possesses weight, extension, visibility, and other properties of matter, all the ancients were materialists. Beyond a doubt, Job, Ezekiel, and John, equally with Plato, Cicero, and the Christian fathers, conceived of spirit as nothing but thin matter, vapor or gas; and the philosophic idea of spirit, now current in the regions of learning, is not older than the days of the European schoolmen. It is at once evident that the recent philosophy cannot be of essential moment to religion. But such a view of materialism is for many reasons unsatisfactory.—Electricity, light, and heat, are regarded even by those moderns who hold the corpuscular theory concerning the two last, to be void of gravitation, and (we believe) of inertia. Yet it is evidently materialism to teach that the substance of the soul is made of these ingredients. Next; to those who will have it that nothing is spirit which has a proper attachment to *space* and *time*, we think it may be fairly replied that our souls do not fulfil this condition. If we know anything about them at all, it is that they stand in most intimate relation to our bodies, and are susceptible of change, growth, and decay, with the progress of time.

* * * * *

"We further assert, that the doctrine of materialism, if it be ever so true, ought not to affect any doctrine of morality or of religion, rightly so called. To put this in a strong light, let us be allowed to make an extravagant supposition, which will give every advantage to the opposite argument. Suppose that a future Mr. Crosse should succeed in constructing a living dog out of inorganic matter, by a series of galvanic operations, and that this dog should display all the sagacity and affection of other dogs; this would be the most decisive imaginable proof of the identity of that substance by which brutes think, feel, and live, with electricity and other forces which act on unorganic matter, yet such an experiment would not have the most remote tendency to undo our experience and our internal perceptions that truth, justice, disinterestedness, humility, compassion, and purity, are better than their opposites; it could not justly lower our reverence and admiration for the great Power who presides over the universe which we behold, or alter in any point the posture of our hearts and spirits towards Him. The sphere of religion is the inner and moral world; and as no external discoveries of philosophy, change the moral and spiritual nature of man, fear of any permanent harm to religion from this quarter is vain. Unwillingly, however, we must confess that such fears do *temporarily* verify themselves. For if the professors of religion proclaim that certain doctrines of philosophy are subversive of religion, too many are found to take them at their word.

"No doubt it is a prevailing idea, that the doctrine of immaterialism is essential as a foundation for that of future retribution. Rightly to discuss this question might need half a volume. Here it might suffice broadly to protest against basing such a doctrine on physical subtleties. The experience of the old Platonists and other schools which committed this error, might sufficiently warn us against it. A man who believed his soul to be immortal, because it was an unchangeable atom in which his self consisted, was irresistibly carried to believe his *past* as well as his *future* immortality, and therefore lost all idea of 'person' in connection with his soul. As Archbishop Whately states it:—'They believed, not their souls but the substance of their souls to be immortal'; and personality being dropped, Pantheism crept in, which was nothing but veiled materialism in its most objectional form. Equally clear is it, that the immortality of the low-

est brutes,—a limpet or a fly—perhaps even that of the souls of vegetables, follows from the same reasoning; as may be seen indeed in Butler's Analogy; and all moral import in a future state becomes more than problematical. But the very basis of the theory is in direct collision with notorious fact. It is pretended the soul is unchangeable, when we have all the proof possible that *it changes from day to day*, and nothing but hardy denial on the other side. And if it be ever so immaterial, it still remains, that what *had its beginning at birth may have its end at death.*

"One other ground of fear from materialism derives too much countenance from a prevailing doctrine of Phrenologists. It is supposed that a materialist must of course be a Necessarian, and must deny that men cannot be justly praised or blamed, rewarded or punished. We know that a necessarian may with logical consistency hold that it is right to punish a man, as we would whip a dog, merely because experience shows the efficacy of the motive; but altho' this satisfies the lower demands of economies, it by no means meets what we believe spiritual religion and sound morality to require....We cannot ourselves see any proper connection between materialism and the doctrine of necessity. The latter controversy is notoriously an entangled one. *Spiritual Fatalists* are not at all *rare* among contemplative and even devout persons; and as far as we can see, the difficulties in the way of believing in human free-agency are equally great, and need to be met by the very same considerations, in the immaterialist as in the materialist theory. No materialist has any right to argue, that as a planet moves without power of self-control, so also must the human brain, if its forces are merely material ones. For the pretended analogy would quite as well prove that it cannot hope and desire, meditate and reflect, as that it cannot act freely upon itself. Into such false analogies those are perhaps peculiarly apt to fall, who have studied inanimate, more than animate or rational nature; and it is hardly fair to charge on materialism, *as such*, the errors which arise out of an undue encroachment of physiology on the domain of morals."—*Prospective Review, March*, 1845.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS.

THE FACTS AND PHENOMENA OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

(*Continued from page* 148.)

An important part of the scriptural evidence against the popular doctrine of the Cross is furnished in the *facts* and *phenomena* of the death of Christ. The intelligent and candid reader will acknowledge that if the current opinions on the subject are correct, they will appear to be borne out by all the circumstances connected with our Lord's last sufferings and death. Here, however, we discover the most conflicting phenomena,—conflicting, that is, with the opinions usually held as to the doctrinal significance of this solemn fact in our Lord's history. Every attempt to interpret the events which cluster around the Cross of the crucified Jesus, on the recognized principles of the popular theology, involves us in strange and painful confusion. The *attitude* of the suffering and dying Christ as set forth in the Gospels exhibits nothing in common with his alleged attitude as the *substitute* for sinners, bearing vicariously their punishment, and drinking the bitter dregs of Divine wrath. We see, indeed, marvellous anguish there, but it does not seem as if it were the result of Divine wrath.—That those sufferings were of the nature of a *judicial satisfaction*, demanded by the justice of God, and only completed when "Jesus cried with a loud voice and expired," appears to us a notion so clearly at variance with the historic phenomena of the case, that we only wonder that ourselves and others should have been so long blind to its obvious disharmony with the Gospel record. As to the process of proof usually adopted by the learned defenders of the popular doctrine, we do not think that we speak only our own experience when we say, that it always struck us as rather perplexingly profound than plain and palpable. Candor obliges us to confess that we received these theological theorizings not so much because we were convinced, but because we were constrained by the popular conscience and the prestige of orthodoxy to accept them as true. And possibly had we never been called upon to publicly defend the popular faith, we might have remained to this day as thoroughly "orthodox" as any of our brethren. We are thankful that even at some painful cost, we have learnt 'a more excellent way'—that our faith in popular infallibilities has been entirely shaken and destroyed, and that we have at last learnt that true godly allegiance to truth which obliges us to appeal first and last to the law and to the testimony for the rule of our faith and the guide of our life. As we have so often said, this is the oracle of our orthodoxy.—To its teachings we make our supreme and final appeal, and by its decisions only we stand or fall.

Opening our oracle, then, we turn to that solemn page which informs us that Jesus knowing his "hour" was come, said to his disciples who had been partaking with him of the last supper, "Arise, let us go hence." Towards Gethsemane they direct their way,—a spot consecrated as the loved resort of Jesus and his disciples for its retirement, and where, removed from the cares and numerous interruptions of the city, they often had passed together many a holy and happy hour. Here once more and for the last time they come, and Jesus bids his disciples remain behind, with the exception of Peter, James, and John, and prepare for the approaching trial by seeking counsel and strength from God. To these chosen three Jesus discloses the depth of his sorrows—a sorrow "even unto death." "Tarry ye here," he says, "and watch with me." To them is entrusted the painful duty of guarding their Lord's retirement, and giving him notice of any hostile intrusion. He himself "went a little further," and there overwhelmed with sorrow, "he fell on his face," and prays that if possible he may be saved from that hour. "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me! nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt." "Being in an agony, he prayed more earnestly;" thrice did he cry to be delivered, "and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground."*

* "Dr. Mead, from Galen, observes, cases sometimes happen in which, through mental pressure, the pores may be so dilated that the blood may issue from

Now here is a phenomenon which it becomes us to look upon with trembling awe, and to write of with the most cautious reverence. Many have speculated on this solemn significance, and have attempted to unravel the mysterious emotions of that terrible hour. It is not our purpose to undertake any such task, but rather to confront that theory of this season of sorrow which has obtained the ascendancy, and arrogated to itself the claim of being exclusively orthodox, with other accompanying phenomena which the sacred history developes. That theory we have often indicated. Suffice it here to remark, that it ascribes the Savior's intense anguish in Gethsemane to the alleged fact that, by a fiction of law, he stood in the place of a world of sinners lying under the wrathful displeasure of God, and exposed to an eternity of miserable torment in hell. He was enduring then the first bitter pangs of the punishment of sin, and writhing under the first mighty pressure of infinite wrath. The "cup" which he so earnestly prayed might if possible pass from him, was the cup of Divine indignation, we are told, put into his hand by the Omnipotent Avenger of sin, and which he was made to drink even to the dregs. It was then that the inexorable law was taking its terrible course—justice exacting its sanguinary satisfaction,—"the concentration of the sufferings of the atonement"* as a popular commentator writes, "pouring together upon him, and filling him with unspeakable anguish." From this representation our moral judgment revolts—and our understanding, in the view simply of the historic phenomena of our Lord's sufferings and death, withholds its assent.

How, we ask, in the view of that fact "*there appeared an angel from heaven, strengthening him,*" can we accept this popular explanation of the agony in the garden? Whence came this angel? "From heaven." For what purpose? To give consolation and strength to the exhausted sufferer. Now either he came on his own account, moved by sympathetic impulses, or he came at the bidding of God. One or other was the cause of this Angelic mission.—But if the suffering Jesus was then in the eye of God but as the concentration of a world's pollution and guilt—if at that moment he was the impersonation of all sinners, and in that assumed character was an object of Divine loathing and indignation, deserving and receiving the dreadful penalty due to their sins, what sympathy could a holy and obedient angel of heaven be conscious of towards him, much less practically express? Nor, under these alleged circumstances, is it conceivable that God could have sent one of his "ministering spirits" to Christ, whose peculiar sonship was for the time being set aside for judicial purposes, and who stood before him in none other than a representative and criminal character. In the view of God, Jesus was *then* not his immaculate Son, in whom he was well pleased, but the impersonation of a guilty and doomed humanity, against whom his anger was kindled, and whom he was about representatively to punish. Inasmuch as God could not give consolation and strength to sinners themselves, when left to the endurance of their condign punishment; he could not so minister to one who is supposed to have been their substitute. And yet, says the record, "there appeared an angel from heaven strengthening him." Here is a clearly revealed historic fact which we invite our readers to confront with these so-called "Evangelical" doctrines. The fact will not be disputed; then the theology of the popular churches *must* be disputed, for there is most obvious contrast and discordance here. If it be a *fact* that an angel from heaven ministered strength and consolation to Jesus during his agony in Gethsemane, then that system of doctrine which we have described, and which the popular churches endorse, must be a notorious and most mischievous *fiction*.

The explanation of our Lord's agony on this occasion seems to be furnished by an apostle. Writing of this sorrow "even unto death" Paul says, "Who (viz. Christ) in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able *to save him from death.*" We shall speak more particularly on this subject as we proceed. No doubt our Lord's dread of death was one chief cause of his anguish, for it should be remembered that death to him was not what it is, or can be to ordinary human beings. But it is probable that there were other elements of grief besides a natural sympathy with his own prospective sufferings. The guilt of the Jewish people in their deliberate rejection of him, and in being about to imbrue their hands in the blood of one who came in the name, and as the representative of God, no doubt pressed heavily on his loving heart. It was not exclusively a sympathy with himself, we may well imagine, that prostrated his soul in anguish. When from the summit of Olivet he looked on the devoted city, and wept over it—when on his way to Calvary, bearing the burden of his own cross, he looked around on the weepers, and bade them weep rather for themselves than for him, we see such a wonderful forgetfulness of self that it is reasonable to suppose that similar feelings were agitating his bosom at this time.—But whether we can, or cannot explain the nature and causes of this mental agony, is not of much importance to our present inquiry; it is sufficient that the circumstances of the case forbid us to accept as the true explanation that offensive theory which is now so generally received.

The language of Christ to the weeping multitude who followed bewailing him is deserving our attention while examining the incidents of this memorable tragedy. The language is not without significance in its aspect towards our present inquiry. "Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children."—We have said that this was the language of loving

---

them; so that there may be a bloody sweat." And Bishop Pearce gives an instance from *Thuanus* of an Italian gentleman being so distressed with the fear of death, that his body was covered with a bloody sweat. —*Dr. Adam Clarke.*

Dr. Doddridge says, (Note on Luke xxii. 44.) that "Aristotle and Diodorus Siculus both mention bloody sweats as attending some extraordinary agony of mind; and I find that Loti, in his life of Pope Sixtus V., and Sir John Chardin, in his history of Persia, mentioning a like phenomenon."

Olshausen in his Commentary on this passage, thinks the force of Luke's language requires us to understand that "a comparison only of the sweat with drops of blood" is intended, and not that there were "identical drops of blood." "His sweat was *as it were* great drops of blood," &c.—Vol. 4, p. 182.

* *Barnes.*—For the scriptural meaning of the word *Atonement*, see pages 79-81 of the present volume of the "Christian Examiner."

sympathy. There is nothing of unfeeling harshness here, as if our Lord was then taunting them with the woes which the national guilt of crucifying him was about to bring upon them. These were genuine sympathizers with his sufferings who attracted his notice on this occasion, and it was not the wont of Jesus harshly to repulse any, much less such as these. But why should Jesus bid these weeping ones dry their tears under circumstances so truly extraordinary as the popular faith represents? If Christ were then on his way to expiate a world's guilt by bearing the desert of a world's punishment, was there not the most abundant reason why tears should flow—scalding tears—tears of blood, if that were possible? "Daughters of Jerusalem," we should rather have expected to hear Christ say, "well may ye weep, for behold the hour of expiation is at hand, and I your substitute and that of the whole world am now going to bear the mighty burden of an infinite punishment which your, and the world's sins have brought upon me. Weep on, daughters of Jerusalem, for great indeed is your guilt which needs so great and fearful an expiation." But not so. "Weep not *for me*" is the singularly strange bidding!

Yet, further, Christ declares to these weeping women that they had more cause to weep *for themselves* than for him, and for the reason that they were about to undergo all the horrors of a sanguinary invasion, in which their city should be taken and destroyed. "Behold the days are coming in which they shall say, Blessed are the barren and the wombs that never bare, and the paps which never gave suck. Then shall they begin to say to the mountains, fall on us; and to the hills, cover us. For if they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in a dry?" Viewed aright, this language exhibits a beautiful illustration of the benevolence and unselfishness of Christ's heart—but how can we understand it, on the supposition that Christ was then on his way to the endurance of a substitutionary and infinite punishment? Our Lord compares his own sufferings with those which they would shortly endure, and he tells them to reserve their tears for themselves, for his sufferings were light in comparison with what awaited them. But what are the horrors of even the worst conceivable siege—its famishings, its desolations of fire, and sword, and pestilence, and the constant apprehension of a terrible death; compared with those inexpressible agonies which we are assured that Christ, as the substitute for sinners, had to endure? Language fails to furnish expression for the horror of this *expiatory* crucifixion. Thought is overpowered by the very effort to conceive the dreadful nature of Christ's *vicarious* sufferings. Does it not, then, seem strange,—unaccountably strange, that Christ should compare his unique and indescribable woe, with that which awaited the Jewish people in their national overthrow, and declare that the sufferings of that national catastrophe would be even *beyond his own?* His,—

"A weight of woe, more than whole worlds could bear,"

lighter and less to be lamented than the woes which the people of Judah would endure in the siege and capture of their city!! Here again we meet with singular inconsistency in examining the phenomena of the Sacred History by the light of popular opinion. That the Lord Jesus should have bidden the daughters of Jerusalem not to weep for him, but rather weep for themselves, as exposed to more terrible calamities than he was about to suffer, is a standing protest against the monstrous construction which is put on the last sufferings of Christ by the dominant theology. Were those sufferings of the nature they are declared to have been, there can be no doubt but that all the circumstances of that awful occasion would have contributed to give them that appearance. Their expiatory character, had such been their character, would by the manner and circumstances of their endurance have stood out in prominent relief, and nothing would have occurred, and especially nothing would be said or done by our Lord which would be adapted even to conceal so important a significance, much less to contradict it. But here, in the phenomena of the last sufferings of Christ, is nothing to be discovered which could make it possible for the actual spectators of them, or ourselves, who read the history from the pens of eye-witnesses, to know that they had any such significance as the popular theology declares they had; but on the other hand very much is to be met with, as we shall have further occasion to show, which obliges us to reject that system of doctrine as having no foundation in, and no harmony with the Sacred History.

(*To be Continued.*)

"BOOKED FOR HELL."

BRO. STORRS:—I am still looking for, and loving the appearing of Christ who is our LIFE. I can assure you that I am not a careless spectator of the conflict that is being waged concerning the glorious topic of Immortality as revealed in the gospel. It is but little that I can do in the cause, yet I would not leave that little undone.

One thing is certain, that the Life question is assuming a greater importance with the passing of every day. Opposers of the doctrine have learned what a few years since many of them were ignorant of, namely, that there *is such a doctrine preached and believed.* Their abortive attempts to meet, or rather to *evade* the true issue, can only be accounted for by recollecting the influences of early prejudice, and the pressure of earthly motives.

Some of them seem to make use of railings, instead of reasons—sneers instead of sense—anathemas instead of arguments. They are welcome to the honor of such a course. *Some* men are not thus deterred from making use of their eyes, ears, and brains. Candidly, we want something else.—When men rail, the reason is presumed to be, because they have no better arguments. When men can only stand and cry "infidelity," "heresy," "unscriptural doctrine," &c., when *they know* that *we* believe the Bible *as firmly* and *as fully*, to say the least, as they do; when *they know* that we can *read* the doctrine out of the Bible, and the only way they can prevent its being done, is by refusing to hear us *read God's Word*, (as they have repeatedly done at church trials;) to have them take such a course as this, and then stand back upon their dignity and infallibility and deliberately doom us to perdition, seems the extremest stretch of impudence, to say nothing of its sin.

Do they do this? There is a man connected

with the New England Methodist Episcopal Conference, as a preacher, named J. D. B. He is esteemed as one of the *leading* preachers in that Conference. (Lord have mercy on those that are *led.*) Well, about the last of August, the Methodists had a camp-meeting at Southampton, Mass. Thursday afternoon, if I recollect rightly, this man undertook to preach from Phil. 1: 28—"And in nothing terrified by your adversaries," &c. He went on to show who the adversaries of the M. E. Church were, and went over with a list of atheists, infidels, Universalists, spirit rappers, &c., and at the conclusion of each head would say—"*I book them for hell!*" At length he pounced upon the believers in "life and death," as revealed in the gospel, and after calling them "soul-sleepers," "annihilationists," and other interesting names, he said, "*Book them for hell!*" And I am informed that he intimated something about sending them there by the *first conveyance.* Thus he went on waxing exceeding zealous, and thinking, no doubt, that his pious "wrath" was working "the righteousness of God." So it did, for the ultimate effect was exceedingly salutary.

Said one Methodist brother, who is interested in the Life question, "I agreed with the preacher in *one thing.* When he commenced to preach, he said, he presumed that his sermon would be called by some the *ugliest* sermon they *ever heard.* I agreed with him *perfectly* there; it *was so.*"

A few reflections are suggested by such kind of talk as this of the Rev. J. D. B.

1. I think this man had forgotten what belonged to common courtesy: and *especially* to the character of the Christian ministry. "The servant of God *must not* strive." He must "be *patient towards all men,*" and "in meekness instruct" (not insult,) "them that oppose themselves, that peradventure God may" (not "book them for hell!" but) "give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." We read of a no less personage than Michael, who once contended with the *very devil himself,* and yet *durst not* bring a *railing* accusation against him. One would think that some of the modern guardians of *pagan tradition* and *heathen fables* had become possessed with the idea, either that *they* are a great deal *better than Michael,* or else that *we* are much *worse than the devil,* and so they seem to imagine that they may *rail* to their hearts' content.

2. I think that this man has not studied his *text* very closely in English or Greek, for if he had he might have seen that the word *apoleia,* perdition, means DESTRUCTION, RUIN, STATE OF BEING DESTROYED, and contains within itself (aside from twenty-five other passages in Paul's epistles that teach the same doctrine,) enough to overthrow his *pagan notion* of *eternal torment.* By the way, last Sunday evening I preached about two hours on a series of passages which were sent me by an unknown person, whose 'nest,' *perhaps,* had been a little 'stirred' by the "Scripture searchers." Well, in giving, as I supposed, *all the passages* he could *find* to sustain *eternal torment,* he could only find *one* in all Paul's *fourteen epistles* which he *dared to quote,* and that was, "Who shall be punished with everlasting DESTRUCTION." "Blindness *in part,* has happened unto" *Methodists.* But to return.

3. I thought J. D. B. a little unmerciful, to "book" us "for hell"—there to be *tormented, tortured, agonize, writhe, wail, blaspheme* God, and *suffer millions of years* of *inconceivable anguish* for *each* and *every* heretical *thought* and *word* and *deed,* and yet when *this* was *past* have all our *sufferings* but *just begun,* and *never to end,* and all this because *we* believe GOD MEANS JUST WHAT HE SAYS, and are willing to forsake, for his truth, *snug parsonages, fat salaries,* or, as *Rev.* J. D. B. might express it, "*desirable appointments.*" Now is it not a little *too bad?* And then to be in such a hurry—the '*first*' 'boat,' or 'stage,' or 'train:' must you have us tormented before the time?

4. Then I thought, "Perhaps after all his talk, he don't think hell *is* such a terrible affair! Perhaps it is only the same to him as being out of the M. E. Church! for certainly if he was orthodox on this point, he wouldn't "book" men off so unceremoniously. And *further*—do you suppose that a whole stand full of *preachers* would have set behind him *laughing,* and a host of people would have sat before him doing *the same,* if *they* hadn't thought he was only in fun? May be he was trying to *mimic* the old *Pope* Leo X., who decreed that the *soul was immortal*—and "condemned all such as taught that the soul was mortal;" and perhaps the people were laughing to see how nicely he carried it out!!

5. I thought perhaps the poor man was *provoked to it* by some who had *pestered* and *bothered* him with *passages of God's Word* till he was out of all patience, and hoped to get rid of them, as the Pope did of heretics, or as a backwoodsman would of *musquetoes* by kindling a FIRE.

Ah, well, Bro. B., this is but "the beginning of sorrows"—and if the "whips" gall you so, I don't know how you will bear the "scorpions."

The *truth* is destined to *spread,* and be it known unto *you,* that *that sermon* did more to *spread it* in the immediate vicinity of that camp-meeting than any other that has been preached for a long while.

Perhaps you do not know that a number of your brethren in "good and regular standing in the M. E. Church," got together, the following Sunday night in the school-house at Westfield Farms, and in the midst of the best meeting they have had, some of them, for fifteen years, concluded that after all they guessed they wasn't "booked for *hell,*" and they preferred going *somewhere else*—especially as *some of them* had *serious doubts* whether there really *was* any just *such* hell as you talked of.

6. I thought I wouldn't feel at all cross or hard toward Bro. B., for it may be he will be in a better mood at another time, and who knows but he may yet preach, that "God only hath immortality?" and if he does not, I shall not judge him, but shall hope to meet him in the better land where we shall *know* a great deal *more,* and *do* a great deal *better* than here.

7. I thought it wouldn't make much difference whether *he* booked us for *heaven* or *hell.* I doubt whether he is an authorized book-keeper for the *former place,* indeed I don't know as he professed to book any one *for heaven* at all. Perhaps his business lay chiefly in another direction.

8. I thought that "the Word of God is not bound; and" *further,* it *never will be;* and men had

better be careful how they oppose its march.—'Potsherds' may do to fight with 'potsherds,' but when they claim *immortality*, and assume the *attributes of the Creator*, they show their own weakness and contemptibility. This last thought was forcibly impressed upon my mind when I was in Springfield Depot, and saw a little *yellow dog* running and barking after a huge locomotive, which was trundling away its ponderous load just as if there wasn't a single *yellow dog* under the whole heavens.

If you judge these thoughts worthy of examination, put them in your valuable Examiner.

Plymouth, Mass., 1853. H. L. H.

EXCERPTS.

Bro. Storrs:—I am pleased with the manner in which, in the June *Examiner*, you dispose of the *Northern Advocate*, as well as the use you have made of the paragraph relating to Dr. Dick. My continued investigations on the *Life and Death* question satisfy me not only that our views are in harmony with the whole tenor of the Bible, but that they will also stand the test of the most enlightened criticism.

Prof. *Geo. Bush*, in his "Notes on Genesis," after expressing his belief that "*living soul*" means the same in Gen. 2: 7, that it does in other places when applied to beasts, says: "As to the intellectual faculties which raise man so far above the tribes of the brute creation, we find no term that expressly designates them in any part of the sacred narrative. * * * * Indeed, it may be remarked that the Scriptures generally afford much less *explicit* proof of the existence of a sentient immaterial principle in man, capable of living and acting separate from the body, than is usually supposed."

Such testimony on this point should, it seems to me, excite the suspicion in "orthodox" minds that the *future life* of man *may*, after all, depend upon a *resurrection from the dead.*

Prof. Bush, speaking of some of the "blemishes" of "the received version" of the Bible, says—"Of these, by far the most prominent is a want of *uniformity* in the mode of rendering, both in regard to single words and to phrases." In what way this "blemish" has served to hide the truth in relation to the *nature of man, the state of the dead*, and *the doom of the wicked*, is clearly and fully brought out in "*Bible vs. Tradition*," where the meaning of *nephesh, ruah, psuche, pneuma, sheol, hades, gehenna*, and other terms and phrases are set forth.

A recent work, entitled, "*The Methodist Preacher*," has a sermon, by your old friend Orange Scott, on the "*Immortality of the Soul.*" I have copied one paragraph and here give it:—

"*There are certain persons, of whom it is said, that they shall never see death.* 'He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and he that liveth and believeth in me, shall *never die.*' 'If any man eat of this bread, he shall *live forever.*' 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, if a man keep my word, he shall *never see death.*'—From hence it appears that by performing certain conditions, men may 'live for ever.' But none are exempt from the death of the body. It is, therefore, the soul that shall not die. We are not, however, to infer from this, that the wicked shall be annihilated: but only, that they shall experience a death from which the righteous are exempt."

I am astonished that such a paragraph should be admitted into a Methodist work, for if it proves any thing, it proves that *Immortality* is to be received only through Christ. But, then, I am reminded that O. Scott abandoned the endless misery theory before he died. I regret that he did not do so before he wrote the sermon in question.

Have you seen Hiram Mattison's work on "Spirit Rappings?" I have examined but one chapter—that devoted to the "Intermediate State,"—and I find he denies that Moses appeared at the transfiguration as a *disembodied spirit*, contending that he was *raised from the dead.* This is a good position against the *rappers*, and it deprives our *double-entity* friends of one of their strongholds.—The same view, I observe, is advanced in a sermon (by Rev. G. G. Hapgood,) on the *Resurrection*, in a work, published a few years since, called "The Methodist Episcopal Pulpit."

Canajoharie, N. Y. Rufus Wendell.

"Where their Worm Dieth Not," &c.

Mark 9: 48.

Richard Watson, in his exposition of the above passage, says—"As the worm itself dies not, but *destroys* that it feeds upon, and as a fire unquenched *consumes* that upon which it kindles, so when temporal judgments are expressed by this phrase, the *utter destruction* of persons, cities, and nations, appears to be intended; but when it refers to a future state, and the subject of the punishment is, in itself, or by Divine appointment, immortal, the idea is heightened to its utmost terror; *their worm* of remorse and reflection ever gnaws; and *the fire*, which represents the severity of accumulated judgments, is never quenched."

We may learn, from this exposition, in what way those passages which clearly teach the "utter destruction" of the ungodly are pressed into the service of the *endless misery* theory. This is done by *assuming* the *unconditional immortality* of all men. The *undying worm* and *unquenchable fire* are not, it will be observed, deemed inappropriate symbols of "*utter destruction*," when "*temporal*" judgments are intended; but when they are applied to *future punishment*, we are required to receive them in a sense that bears not the slightest analogy to their original import! The necessity for this violent interpretation vanishes when we come to regard man, agreeably with the uniform testimony of God's Word, as a probationer for an endless existence. *Then* it becomes apparent that "utter destruction" *must* be the doom of the finally impenitent. "They shall," says an apostle, "*utterly perish* in their own corruption." In what will this differ from the "utter destruction" of which Mr. Watson speaks? R. Wendell.

Canajoharie, N. Y., Aug. 25, 1853.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER, 1853.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—One more number completes this volume. We shall act as heretofore, viz.—*Discontinue* sending the Examiner to all persons who have *not paid in advance* for the *next* volume. Those, therefore, who do not receive the paper for January, 1854, will know the reason is, that we have not received payment according to our terms. If any think themselves entitled to it, let them inform us, stating the circumstances, and we will make it right.

Soon as we have issued the Dec. number, we shall have the volumes for 1852 and 1853 bound in *one* volume. Those who wish for it in that form will please let us know soon, as we can supply only a limited number of copies. The *price* will be $1.50.

We can supply a few copies of the Examiner, *in sheets*, for '49, '50, '51, and '52. *Price*, 50 cents for each of those years.

The proposition for next year is as follows:

1. If we receive one thousand dollars by Dec. 25th, from subscribers or otherwise, we will publish the Examiner *twice* each month at $1 per year.

2. Or, if fifteen hundred *paying* subscribers are secured by January first, at $2 per year, then we will publish it *weekly.*

3. If neither of the previous propositions are met, then we shall go on *monthly* as heretofore; but any person who pays $1, prior to Dec. 25th, shall be entitled to a copy of Br. Blain's new work—"*Death not Life*,"—*without charge*; they paying the postage. This offer applies only in case of the Examiner being published *monthly.*

A RESPONSE FROM DR. MCCULLOH

Baltimore, Md., Sep., 1853.

MR. GEORGE STORRS,—*Dear Sir:*—I have just received the October number of the Bible Examiner, and am gratified to find the prospect so good of extending the simple truths of the Gospel, by making it the interpreter of itself, and not in conceding any thing to the authority of men.

To help you towards publishing your periodical twice a month, I forward you ten dollars.

With all good wishes to you,

I am, &c.,

J. H. MCCULLOH.

Dr. McCulloh will accept our thanks; and, also, Jacob Grim, of Philadelphia, from whom we have received eleven dollars for the same object.

ED. OF EX.

BIBLE VS. TRADITION.—This work still continues to be called for, and we have just issued the "*Third* Edition." Let it be sent into every corner of the land: it is a thorough cure for the natural immortality theory; and shows beyond a reasonable doubt that Life and Immortality are the gift of God through Jesus Christ *alone*, and by the resurrection at the last day.

Price, 75 cents. For $5, *ten* copies. Sent in all cases at the expense of the purchaser, except where $1 is sent for one copy, and the two double Examiners containing Ham's Works, then we pay the postage.

"DEATH NOT LIFE."—This work, also, has had a rapid sale; thirteen hundred copies having been disposed of in two months. Another edition is now issued. Let it be placed in every neighborhood; it will open eyes to see the deception that has been practiced to conceal the fact that the doctrine of *endless misery* is not taught in the Bible, but is a pure fiction, invented by men. Price, 25 cents; or six copies for one dollar. Postage to be paid by the purchaser.

Both of the forenamed works should be scattered by tons of thousands; let it be done.

"PAULINE THEOLOGY; or, *The Christian Doctrine of Future Punishment as Taught in the Epistles of Paul.* By H. L. Hastings, Plymouth, Mass." A neat pamphlet of 48 pages, 12 mo. A valuable work. For sale at the Bible Examiner Office, 140 Fulton-street, N. Y. *Price*, 10 cents. Also for sale at 26 State-st., Hartford, Conn., Second Advent Watchman office, and by the Author. It should be put into every house in the land.

VISIT TO DANSVILLE.—We were absent from New York city nine days—traveled seven hundred miles, and preached twelve times. Our meeting was well attended by an intelligent class of people. The weather was fine and mild; and we had a most delightful interview with the brethren. Truly it was good to be there. The truth is clearly advancing in that region.

Br. Wm. Brown's house was our resting place whilst at Dansville; and we felt much at home in his kind family.

We met our fellow-laborer, C. F. Sweet, there, and was much interested and pleased with our interview. He now goes out under the patronage of the Prov. Com. May the Lord abundantly bless

him in his labors. Others in that region, we trust, will soon launch forth into the work.

The friends at Dansville will accept our thanks for their liberality in helping us on our way. They also subscribed some thirty dollars for the Prov. Com., through Br. Blain, who was present with us part of the time.

—o—

PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE.

We have thought best to republish, from the March Examiner, the first notice of this Committee and *its object.* It is as follows:—

"PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE.—A few of us have assumed this name, with the determination to search out laborers, and proffer them *help* in the field of their labors, to scatter light on the *Life theme.* The spread of light on this subject is our *only* object. This we state frankly; not that we desire to restrict the laborers so that they will not feel themselves free on other topics; but this theme is the one upon which we shall aim to give light; and we now call upon all who love it to lend us a helping hand, by contributing to the funds, and by your counsel and prayers. We believe the time has come that God expects us all to show more fully our faith by our works. The *living voice* must be heard proclaiming *Life* in the name of Jesus *alone;* and those who make the proclamation must be sustained. Let all who have a willing mind send funds to the Provisionary Committee, in New York, or raise such a Committee in their own town or county, and act at once in this matter.

HENRY A. CHITTENDEN,
HENRY F. JOHNSON,
GEORGE STORRS. } *Prov. Com.*

New York, March, 1st, 1853."

The *object* thus expressed last March is still the object.

The Preachers laboring in the *Life Theme*, on the ground proposed by the *Prov. Com.*, and under its patronage, are the following, viz:

C. M. RICHMOND, of Peru, Ind., in Central Indiana.

JACOB BLAIN, of Buffalo, N. Y., in Western New York.

W. S. CAMPBELL, of Chester Factories, Mass., in Western Mass. and Eastern N. Y.

J. S. WHITE, of Worcester, Mass., in Massachusetts.

T. GARBUTT, of Orangeport, N. Y., in the counties in that vicinity.

C. F. SWEET, of Ulster, Pa., in Northern Pa., and Southern N. Y.

Others will be added to the list as fast as approved men can be found who are willing to go to the work. We have hesitated, hitherto, in soliciting preaching brethren to engage under the patronage of the *Prov. Com.*, fearing that we might disappoint them in relation to the pecuniary assistance which we know they need, and ought to have. Each man, who has a family, certainly *ought* to receive about $300 per year, if he is devoting his whole time to the work. The Committee think that a *small* sum; and there should be added to it *necessary* traveling expenses. We wish to do every thing in this matter *openly:* we have no *private* designs or object. No one of our Committee charge or receive any thing for our services in this matter. All the money contributed to the *Com.* is applied to sustain the Preachers who go out under its patronage; and the application of it will be stated from time to time in the Examiner, so that all can judge for themselves whether their offerings have been properly applied.

Shall these men be sustained, who go forth bearing the precious seed of Life Eternal? Has God given any of us this world's goods to hoard up, while men of God are laboring to spread the truth, asking only that they may have sufficient to keep them and their families from actual want? Brethren and friends, let us ask ourselves whether we do not owe a debt of gratitude to God for the light He has granted us; and whether we are not bound to repay that debt by contributing to scatter the same light to those persons who are still bound in the miserable chains of superstition, which so long afflicted and tormented ourselves?

The *Prov. Com.* are not anxious that you should make them the *distributors* of your bounty. We would prefer that in every county the friends should have a *Prov. Com.* to receive and pay over to some preacher or preachers, in whom they have confidence, all that they may be able to collect. But if they prefer that we should receive and distribute their bounty, we are willing to do so according to our best judgment: yet, if any choose to designate to what preacher, in particular, they will have their money applied, it will be so applied; or if they wish it should be applied to publish works on the *Life Theme*, for *gratuitous* distribution, it shall be so done. We wish every one's bounty applied so as to meet the approval of the donor.

Now is the time to come up, with renewed zeal, to the help of the Lord in publishing *Life only* through Christ; and the *Prov. Com.* have ventured to encourage several more Preachers to launch forth in the work, believing that the hearts of the lovers of the glorious truth we promulgate will be opened to help these men of God. Shall we be disappointed? We trust not. Say at once, friends, what you will do in the matter. Send your bounty

direct to "*Geo. Storrs*, New York," or pay it to either of the Preachers whose names we have given you above. In acknowledging money paid, the name of the individual donor will not appear in the Examiner—unless it is necessary for satisfaction as to the fact that it is received—but the *amount* only. We wish nothing done for *show*, or through emulation. Let us work for God and his Christ, and wait till the resurrection of the just for our reward.

GEO. STORRS, *for the Prov. Com.*

New York, Nov. 1, 1853.

RECEIPTS BY PROV. COM.

Acknowledged previous to October,	$142.65
During the month of Oct., as follows:—	
By Br. Blain, from friends in Lockport, N. Y.	5.00
" " " Buffalo, "	5.00
" " " Honeoye, "	16.00
" " " Fredonia, "	8.00
" " " Dansville, "	6.00
" A friend, E. Springwater, "	2.00
By Br. C. M. Richmond, from friends in La Fayette, Ind.	9.00
Total receipts, to Nov. 1st,	$193.65

DISBURSEMENTS BY PROV. COM., TO NOV. 1st.

To Br. C. M. Richmond, - - -	$115.40
To Br. J. Blain, - - - - -	42.00
To Br. C. F. Sweet, - - - - -	20.00
To Br. Thomas Garbutt, - - -	20.00
For Tracts distributed by C. M. Richmond,	4.37
Total disbursements, - -	$201.77
Treasury overdrawn, - - -	$8.12

GEO. STORRS, *Treasurer for Pro. Com.*

P. S. Bro. Blain has obtained some $100 in *pledges*, besides the above amount paid in. All this he has done in about six weeks.

BR. C. M. RICHMOND.—In September, this brother visited Ohio, to attend a "Family Convention" at his father's house: a convention at which all the children and grand-children are expected to be present. His father is a Preacher, (Baptist, we suppose,) and has *three sons*, who are preachers. At these conventions—which are *Triennial*, we believe—the father preaches a sermon, and each of his sons also. Br. Richmond must have had a trial to stand his ground on this occasion; but it seems God enabled him to testify for the truth. He thus speaks of it:—

The *Family Convention* is closed. I had the privilege, on the Sabbath, of presenting the truth on the penalty of God's law, to a large and attentive congregation. Of course it gave offence to some; for the time is come when men will not endure sound doctrine. After preaching many called upon me for publications. Some declared that they were convinced that the wicked would cease to exist.

My dear brother, I am bound up in the work of preaching the glorious Truth. I cannot refrain.—The light shines so clear upon my own mind, and the orthodox system seems so unscriptural and absurd, that I *must preach the whole truth* with all the ability God has given me. It is really painful to be obliged to leave awakened inquirers and pass on to other fields of labor, and know that all the bigotry and ingenuity of orthodoxy will exert themselves to extinguish, or befog the ways of truth.—But God is on the side of truth, and it will and must prevail. Your brother in Christ,

Sheffield, Ohio. C. M. RICHMOND.

The foregoing was received too late for our last, and we now give the following along with it.

BRO. STORRS:—On my return to this place I spent a Sabbath at Fort Wayne. The truth on life and death, was presented in the afternoon and evening. At night the Court House was full.—Many were disposed to receive the truth. Unfortunately I had scarcely any publications with me, for they were, in many cases, earnestly desired. I was solicited to visit them again, which I shall endeavor to do soon. In that city, as in other places, the strongest opposition, and the most bitter and bigoted spirit was manifested by leading professors of religion. I will give an instance. After I had presented the Bible doctrine, of the constitution and destiny of man, and dismissed the congregation, a prominent Methodist stepped forward, and insultingly asked, "*How long, sir, have you been a missionary of the Devil?*" and indulged in other abusive and uncourteous language. But the "spirit he was of" was manifest to all, and fully appreciated. Soon after this occurrence, two gentlemen, (and not professors of religion,) called upon me and apologized for the rudeness of their fellow-citizen, to a stranger who was peaceably presenting Bible Truth, as he understood it, to the people.

I am now laboring in different localities in this county. I was recently visited by an old Baptist minister, who earnestly exhorted me *not to discuss nor preach* on the state of the dead, and penalty of the law! "But none of these things move me." I am happy to say that the discussion in the "*Sentinel*," is doing, without doubt, a good work. The Truth is still onward in this part of the State. C. M. RICHMOND.

Peru, Ind., Oct. 13, 1853.

THE WHOLE TRUTH.

The whole truth given to man in the Bible for his benefit and salvation, is comprehended under four heads:

1st. Man as *he was* in his origin and condition before the fall.

2nd. Man as *he is* in his present state since the fall.

3rd. Man as *he will be* in his future state and final condition.

4th. *The means* or conditions *by which* his future state will be settled or determined.

My purpose is, wherever I go, to speak on some

part of this whole truth, as I understand it—looking for Eternal Life *only* through Jesus Christ our Lord. J. S. WHITE.

———o———

SPIRIT RAPPINGS.—The *New York Daily Times*, of Oct. 20th, in speaking of Judge EDMONDS, who has recently published a work in defence of Spirit Rapping, says:—

"Judge EDMONDS is guilty of the folly of saying that *the doctrine* of the Soul's Immortality is now, for the first time, put beyond a doubt. We have read his book with all reasonable care; and we defy Judge EDMONDS to point out, in these pretended revelations of BACON, SWEDENBORG, and the rest, a single thought or *doctrine* now for the first time revealed, or adding any substantial or useful knowledge."

The *Times* adds:—

"Throughout this farrago of revelation there is one thread which unites them into a systematic whole—and that is their steady hostility to the essential elements of Christianity, * * * *every distinctive article of the Christian faith is negatived by these pretended revelations.*"

The italicising in this extract is ours. If our neighbor of the *Times* is correct in this last statement—and we think he is—then "*the doctrine* of the Soul's Immortality" *is not* an "*article of the Christian faith;*" for, "this farrago of revelations" does *not* "*negative*" *that* doctrine, but *affirms* it, and makes it the foundation of all its blasphemies. The *so-called* "*Christian sects*" have laid a foundation—*not* from the Bible, but out of their own fancies—and Judge EDMONDS and others with him build thereon. Thus speaks the "Hon. N. P. Tallmadge," in his letter on "Spiritual Manifestations":—

"Let me scan this subject for one moment, and present one simple view, which, it seems to me, comprises the whole in a nut-shell. It is the belief of *all Christian denominations*, at the present day, that *departed spirits revisit the earth*, that they attend us, that they impress us to go or not to go, to do or not to do, for our good. Every one's experience will satisfy him of the truth of this remark. What then follows? If spirits visit us, attend us, and impress us for our good, what is the objection to believing that a mode is now discovered by which they can communicate with us?—There can be no possible objection, provided the facts justify that belief. If the one is for our good, the other is still more for our good. If the facts justify it, the conclusion is both reasonable and philosophical. Do the facts justify it? I undertake to say they do. I undertake to say, too, that no intelligent mind that investigates with a sincere desire to ascertain the truth, and has the opportunity to do so, can come to any other conclusion. What, then, is the result of this mighty outcry, as if heaven and earth were coming together? Why, simply, that it has been ascertained that spirits can communicate with us, in addition to impressing us! It hath this extent, no more."

What could be more evident than such a conclusion from the premises? If the soul is immortal, it must survive in death, actively. This belief of the sects is the *root* and the *only* root of all this *modern witchcraft*, called "Spiritual Manifestations," or "Spirit Rappings." Kill the roots and this "spiritual wickedness" falls to the ground. Instead of this, however, the sects are laboring, and laboring in vain, to stop the flood which their own *un*-"christian faith" has set in motion. We hope they will yet see, that the only way to stay that desolating plague is, by taking the Bible ground—"No Immortality, or Eternal Life except through Christ *alone* and by *a resurrection from the dead.*" This will give them a power which nothing else can.

———o———

THE OPPOSITION.—A friend has sent us four numbers of the *Zion's Herald and Wesleyan Journal*—a Methodist paper published at Boston, Mass.—containing a series of articles headed "MATERIALISM ANTI-SCRIPTURAL; or, *The Doctrines of George Storrs Examined and Refuted*, by Rev. N. D. George."

Several friends have written requesting us to review the articles. The great difficulty, at present, is—so far as *we* are concerned—we see nothing to review. There is not only nothing *new* in the articles—so far as they relate to us—but the writer has failed to touch the foundation stone in the argument, and spent what little strength he had in trying to remove here and there a brick from the superstructure. Let him prove—if he can—that the Lord God did not make *man* of *matter:* then he will have taken the *first* step in his mighty labor.—Either the said Reviewer is afraid to "*feel the pillars,*" or else is ignorant of the first principles of the oracles of God. If *man* was made of *matter,* then "Materialism" *is not* "Anti-Scriptural."—Moses affirms—at the outset—"The Lord God *formed man* of the *dust of the ground.*" We rather think that must be "*material.*" If N. D. George can prove it is not, he should go immediately to Rome for a "*Cardinal's hat,*" for he will have performed as great a miracle as that of converting bread and wine into "the *real* body and blood of Jesus."

———o———

"THE SOUL."—We have received an article from Br. E. R. PINNEY, of Seneca Falls, N. Y., on this topic. He has been with us on the Life Theme for eight or ten years; but a severe cancer on his face has prevented his continuing in his public ministry for several years past. We sympathize with him in his deep and protracted sufferings; but we are glad that his heart is yet on the truth. We have just received the following letter from him, accom-

panying the aforesaid article. We have not yet had time to examine it, but shall do so soon. If it goes into the Examiner we think not best to commence till January, as it cannot well all be published at once. His letter will give an intimation of his view of "the soul." He has recently been abroad on a visiting tour, and says:—

BR. STORRS:—By the grace of God I am home once more, and am tolerable comfortable for me.—I have been for a week past laboring under a severe cold, which has started the canker again, and it is now eating quite fast. My canker is worse than ever. I have prepared the article on 'the soul' of which I spoke in a previous letter. I feel an unwavering consciousness of the truth that "the blood is the soul." Never more so on any point, for no other point is established on so many plain and positive declarations forbidding any other interpretation. For the unconsciousness of the dead we have but one plain positive declaration, "The dead know not anything," and we rest with confidence upon it. Here we have five, the most unequivocal declarations possible. I do not see how any one can be clear on the doctrines of redemption without it. No truth is so effectual with the orthodox as this. They cannot meet it, nor can they possibly give a substitute for it.

In a conversation with a Presbyterian minister a few days since, (and a Hebrew scholar,) I saw this illustrated. He admitted at once that the true rendering of *Nephesh* was soul. I then turned to Gen. 9: 4, Deut. 12: 23, &c., and I asked him if those passages did not teach that the blood was the soul? He said it appeared so, but he could not believe it. O, well, I said, you must settle that with God; if He has revealed himself falsely on the point I cannot help it; I am only showing you what God says. I then asked him, 'If God had anywhere said that any other part of man was the soul? He confessed he did not recollect that he did. We then passed on to the end of the wicked, and I soon annihilated them to his utter confusion. When he left, he said he had got some new ideas. Several of his hearers were present, and from the conversation saw his weakness on the Scriptures, and had their eyes opened so that before I left they began to see "men as trees walking," and bought all the books I had with me—"Bible vs. Tradition,"—"Death not Life," and many small tracts. The minister is in trouble for his craft, and has preached against the destruction of the wicked ever since I left. He is doing nobly for the cause. Universalism cannot stand a moment before this truth, it annihilates the whole theory at a blow.

I think I shall get this out in tract form and connect with it an article showing its bearings upon various doctrines, especially the destruction of the wicked, in a cheap form of some 32 pages at $3.00 per hundred. I never felt so much the need of a tract condensing these points in a small cheap form as during this tour. What do you think of it? I was so unwell while in New York that I did not call at your office. Farewell. Grace be with you, through Christ. My trust is still in the living God.

As ever, yours,
E. R. PINNEY.

FROM SISTER ROWLEY.

New Lebanon, N. Y., Sept. 8th, 1853.

BR. STORRS:—As I am taking your valuable paper, and have become very much interested in the truths it contains, and have had many a rich feast in their perusal, therefore, I thought I would send you a history of my conversion to the truths and doctrines of the Bible. I say Bible doctrines, because I have become convinced that the popular doctrine is the doctrine of men, which they have obtained from tradition; in particular, the doctrine of natural immortality. We know God has implanted in every soul a natural desire for life and immortality. But it does not follow as a consequence that we are immortal.

The providence of God led me, last winter, to visit friends in La Porte, Ind., where I heard the Rev. S. C. Chandler preach. One of my neighbors was there also at the same time, who never felt an interest in the Bible; but hearing from its pages the plain truths and declarations of God's Word, has become very much interested in those important truths. We heard him preach a number of sermons on doctrinal points, and attended a Bible class in which those points were discussed. The first sermon I heard was on the state of the dead, which completely stript me of my old hope of going to heaven at death.

On examining the subject, and comparing one text with another, of the precious volume, I was convinced that there was no foundation in the Word of God to build such a hope upon; and on many other points, on close examination, I found myself in gross error. Therefore, I could not resist the truth, but embraced it at once. Whereas I was once blind now I see; and wonder why I did not see before, when the Bible is so plain on those subjects, and no intimation of a disembodied soul or separate state of existence. It is strange many people will not see when their eyes are opened. I am afraid they are wilfully blind, and sacrifice truth for the sake of popularity. Christ says, He that is ashamed to confess me before men, him will I be ashamed to confess before my Father and the holy angels.

Why do men show such a disposition to substitute something in place of God's plain declarations, "*Thou shalt surely die*"? Because, the natural heart is enmity to God. I am established in the doctrines of the Bible, and am seeking for life and immortality through Christ alone. I believe the doctrine of natural immortality and endless torments has done more to make infidels, and to destroy souls, than all other doctrines put together.—I have had some experience in the matter. My husband, who now lies sleeping in the grave—and will, according to the Word of God, until the resurrection morning—did not believe the popular doctrine of endless torments; therefore threw away the whole Bible. Such facts are lamentable, but so it is. I am accused of embracing error, infidelity, &c. I am happy that I can appeal to higher authority than man's judgment. God must be our judge; therefore, I dare not hold to the old doctrine for the sake of popularity; but I feel willing to suffer persecution for the sake of Christ and his cause. I am in the midst of opposers. May God

speed the day when my friends and neighbors will embrace the truth as it is, and seek for life and immortality through Christ alone, at the resurrection of the just, when He has declared He will give rewards.

I am glad to learn, through your paper, that light is spreading and truth gaining ground, and thinking men are waking up to this subject, and *good men* too, as friend "Y." says.

"Precious Bible! what a treasure,
Does the Word of God afford," &c.

When rightly understood, how harmonious and glorious in all its parts. Like an instrument of a thousand strings, when touched by the hand of one skilled in the art, each string vibrates in harmony.

A. F. Rowley.

—o—

From Br. J. Blain.

New York, Oct. 20, 1853.

Br. Storrs:—Aug. 27th, I commenced devoting my whole time to the work, for which I was appointed by the Prov. Com., namely, to preach, dispose of books, and especially to solicit funds for sending out missionaries. At the Conference at Fredonia, and in Buffalo, I spent three weeks—sold and gave away 240 copies of my work, "Death not Life," and a number of the Bible vs. Tradition. In these places, and at Orangeport, Honeoye, Springwater, and Dansville, I obtained subscriptions for the Committee to the amount of $140. By occasional efforts from April till Aug. 27th, I got $25 signed, and $56 paid in, as noticed in the Bible Examiner, at different times—making in all $221.—Having obtained a subscription of $140, in 5 weeks, I am encouraged, and believe means exist, and will be forthcoming, under this wise and safe arrangement, to support all the ministers the Committee can obtain, or all who are willing to take appointments and labor as the Committee propose. I am pained to know and hear of many who are compelled to leave the Lord's work "to serve tables," who are well qualified to preach, and to aid in establishing the doctrine of *Life only through Christ*, and in rooting out of the churches the horrid doctrine of eternal torments. I should judge that more than half who hold our views, are under the necessity, a part or most of the time, thus to leave the field in which they love to labor and which is "white for the harvest." They are *groaning* in their shops, and on their farms, while they see the desolations which error is making, and hear the cry, "come over and help us." I thank God I am not thus groaning myself, but feeling deeply for those who are, and for the truth. I shall, the Lord permitting, labor hard to release them; and call on brethren, who have "this world's goods" to aid, and not be found, when the Lord comes, "muzzling the ox that treadeth out the corn." Matt. 25: 45, I apprehend means more than many are aware of—"Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me." If Christ were again on earth, would we, if but few, support him so that he could "go about doing good," &c.? Who are his "servants," whom he has sent to take his place, or do his work in his absence? Peter said, "I go a fishing"; but God soon put it in the hearts of his children to "sell their possessions," &c., and call Peter from his nets to "feed the sheep and lambs"; and I trust the time has come for modern Peters to leave their "fishing" business, and become "fishers of men." "There is much land to possess," and "we are able to go up and possess it"; for "the Lord is working with us."

I rejoice that brethren have generally become convinced that *union* and *order* are needed in doing the Lord's work; and hope that all ministers who love our truths will soon be released from the disagreeable and unsuccessful task of asking aid for themselves, individually.

Brethren, permit me to ask your attention to Phil. 4: 10–19—"I desire fruit that may abound to your account." The Lord willing it, I design to call on many of you soon, and request an explanation of this portion of God's word, as I fear it has been overlooked by many of late.

Nearly all my work, 1300 copies, have been disposed of in two months, and I am here to make some additions and publish another edition.—240 have been given at my own expense, and the rest sold. I have also sold over 75 of the Bible vs. Tradition, and some other works. My traveling expenses have been but $7. I purpose spending a few weeks more in Eastern N. Y., and then visit brethren in the Eastern States.

J. Blain.

—o—

THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN.

Gen. 11: 7.—"The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."

Our text declares, "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."

Now, regarding this as a plain and perspicuous deliverance on the subject of man's constitution, *three* things present themselves for our consideration, viz., "dust of the ground," "breath of life," and "living soul."

First, then, we have *dust of the ground*, from which, it is affirmed, the Lord God formed or constituted man. The definition here given it, will be observed, is quite unqualified: "formed man of the dust;" not a *part* of man—not man's *body*, but MAN HIMSELF; comprehending at once all the mysterious properties and functions of his wonderful constitution. And mark, the only element introduced is *dust*, "dust of the ground," or, more correctly, "red clay," the organizing of which, by the power and wisdom of the Almighty, is emphatically designated the formation or creation of man.

Next in order we have *the breath of life*, or life-giving breath, which we are informed was infused into man, consequent upon his erection from the dust. By the phrase, "breath of life," or, more literally, "breath of *lives*," (margin,) is doubtless intended the atmospheric air, the respiration of which constitutes the life of all animated flesh. The plural form of the term, as used in this connection, expresses the perfect equality of man in the mode of his existence, with all the other living creatures; so that, in this respect at least, "man hath no pre-eminence above a beast." Concerning this breath of lives, it is said, "The Lord God breathed into man's nostrils;" by which is simply implied, that,

through the agency or power of God, the organized dust, endowed with all the attributes, physical, mental, and moral, of a man, but, as yet motionless and dead, began to respire; which respiration by the lungs would at once propel the vital fluid thro' the whole system, and so produce, in the language of the record, "a living soul."

And this brings us to the last particular in the narrative, viz.; *man became*, literally, *grew into, a living soul.*

And here the first thing which strikes us is the marked peculiarity in the mode of expression, a peculiarity, the misrepresentation of which, by all popular expositors, has produced the most melancholy confusion in the general mind concerning what ought to be plain to the weakest intelligence —*the Scripture doctrine of the constitution of man.* This peculiarity will appear, if the reader will attend for a moment to what is affirmed to have become a living soul. Mark, God is not said to have infused *into* man a soul, but *man himself*—the organized being, is declared to have become LIVING SOUL. To see this more clearly, consider that *two* things only are spoken of as constituting the nature of man, viz., *dust* and *breath.*

Thus, in the first member of the verse, it is said, "God formed *man* of the dust of the ground," that is, according to the above definition—*the entire human being;* then, into this completely formed man the breath of life is inspired, the result of which is, man—the whole creature *becomes* living soul. Observe then, it was man, the organized and animated clay, that became living soul. Mark, not *soul* simply, but *living soul;* the force of which is, clearly, that man was to all intents and purposes a soul before his animation; by the breathing of the oxygenated atmosphere, "man *became* a living soul;" which is in other words to say, that anterior to this event, man was a dead soul—a soul inanimate; but through the inhalation of the life-giving and life-sustaining breath, he came forth a SOUL ALIVE; in one word, a living man, with all the sublime faculties and energies of an intelligent and moral being.

To sum up the testimony, man is nothing more and nothing less than a material compound of the two principles—*dust of the ground* and *breath of life*, the union of which constitutes him a LIVING SOUL.

Other element there is none introduced in the inspired account of our nature, which, on the ground of the principle with which we started, we now make bold to say, stands unrefutable amid all the infinite jargon of a heathenish philosophy and contradictory babble of a false and semi-pagan theology. Contradict it who may, it is the truth of God that MAN has but a MATERIAL and MORTAL constitution, which, according to the Almighty himself, was reared from the dust, and is destined again to be resolved into its kindred element.

Spirituality, indestructibility, and deathlessness, the popular attributes of a soul, are hereby ignored. SOULS ARE BUT FRAIL ORGANIZED AND ANIMATED DUST! transient and perishable as the moth; and which, unless the mercy and power of the Eternal intervene, must finally, like the insect of a day, hopelessly evanish from being, and become in the universe as though they had never been!*

* The above clear exposition forms nearly the whole of the first of the "Bath Series" of tracts, to be issued monthly in that city. God prosper the effort.

Ed. Expositor, [Moncrieff].

[*From Ham's Christian Examiner*]

THOUGHTS ON TEXTS.

ROMANS, CHAP. V. 6–11.

The object of Paul in these verses appears to be to sustain his own and fellow-believers' confidence in the certainty of obtaining salvation, and to encourage this confidence, he naturally recalls to mind the LOVE of God as set forth in the MEANS by which he and his fellow-believers became obedient to the faith. That great means was the belief of the fact that "Christ died for the *ungodly.*" It was this thought that filled the apostle with admiration—that Christ should die "*for the ungodly.*" "For," said he, "scarcely for a *righteous* man will one die, although it is possible that for a *good* man some would even dare to die," but that Christ should die for *bad* men, the *ungodly!* This was love indeed! Hence he proceeds, "But God commendeth his love towards us, in that, *while we were yet sinners*, Christ died for us." Here then was the foundation of his belief that God, who had showed so much love in the outset, would certainly not withhold his loving-kindness in the end. On this fact then he advances to build his consolatory argument. And his logic is very simple. Surely, he reasons, if Christ so loved us when we were *sinners* as to be willing to sacrifice his personal comfort, and even his life, in the great work of converting us from the error of our ways, now that his great love towards us, in dying for us, has begotten within our bosoms a responsive love, and made us obedient to him, he will give us that salvation of Life Eternal for which, at so great a sacrifice, he has prepared us? If when we were enemies to God, and living in disobedience to his laws, Christ destroyed our enmity, to his heavenly Father, and reconciled us to him and his service, at the great cost of his own sufferings and death, surely now that we are no longer living at enmity with God, but are reconciled to him, we shall be saved by Christ and made partakers of his incorruptible life. The reasoning is simply this,—If Christ has loved us so much that, for the sake of making us personally holy, he has made such immense sacrifice, most certainly, now that we are made holy, he will not suffer us to be destroyed by that righteous "wrath," which is revealed against all ungodliness,—"Much more then, being now justified [made personally righteous] by [at the cost and through the appealing influences of] his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by [at the cost, and sympathetic power of] the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, [now that we are reconciled] we shall be saved by his life. And not only so," for this confidence of ours has filled us with the ecstasy of joy, and hence "we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the reconciliation."*

* See the margin where the word *reconciliation* is given as the proper translation.—This is the same word as is translated twice *reconciled* in the previous verse, and the sense obviously requires that the word *reconciliation* should be preserved as given in the mar-

Need we add that Paul is not here speaking of God's reconciliation *to us*, but of our reconciliation *to God;* hence, he says, *not* that GOD has received the atonement or reconciliation, but that *we* have received the atonement or reconciliation;—that is, as *we* had to be reconciled to God, being enemies to him, of course, *we*, and not God, have received the atonement or reconciliation. (See "Christian Examiner," pp. 79–81. Article, Atonement.)—ED.

ROMANS, VI. 10.

"For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God."

In what sense Christ "died unto sin," is made very plain by the context. The apostle commences the chapter by asking, "shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" and replies with virtuous indignation, "God forbid. How shall we then that are *dead to sin*, live any longer therein?" To *die to sin*, then, means to *cease from the practice of sin.* In apostolic phraseology, a man is said to be dead to sin, who is no longer under its control and influence,—who has no eye for its attractiveness,—no ear for its invitations,—no heart for its enjoyments,—"For he that is dead," he says, "is freed from sin." In this sense Christ, when he died on the cross, "died unto sin;"—sin could neither seduce nor subdue him:—"the prince of this world cometh," he said, "and hath nothing in me." If the cross must be his penalty for resisting sin, then he would "resist unto blood striving against sin."—The perfection of Christ's nature renders him as one dead to sin, and alive only to God, and righteousness. His nature responds to nothing sinful, but only to truth and holiness. Christ's death unto sin, of which the death on the cross was the outward expression, is hence made by the apostle an *example* unto all believers. As HE "died unto sin," so must also they: "*Likewise* reckon ye also yourselves to be *dead indeed unto sin*, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." If Paul's language were literally rendered it would be, "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be *corpses* indeed unto sin," &c., which brings out more emphatically the meaning of the phrase, "dead unto sin." Paul, we repeat, exhibits Christ's deadness to sin for the *example* of his church,—they are "likewise to reckon" themselves *dead indeed unto sin*,—and therefore he thus exhorts them in the words immediately following:—"Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal bodies, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof. Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God."

We need scarcely caution the reader against supposing that Paul meant that Christ "died unto sin once," in the sense of dying to bear the *punishment* of sin, or to give a *satisfaction* for sin, for if Paul meant this, he would never have held *such a death* up for the *example* and *imitation* of the church, as he does when he says, "*Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin.*"—*Ed. Chris. Ex. (Eng.)*

———o———

BURY.—We have received a printed document from the Rev. F. Howorth, of Bury, announcing the formation in that town of a "*Free Christian Church.*" It rejoices us to see that the churches of our land are beginning to emancipate themselves from that mischievous ecclesiastical centralization by which, among Dissenters, as well as Churchmen, liberty of conscience and speech have been so long prohibited. Christian liberty and brotherhood are impossible on the basis of the old corrupt corporations, the churches that will be free, faithful and fraternal, must find another foundation than that on which they have hitherto stood, even that which Christ has laid, and which we think the Church at Bury have adopted, when they say, "it is based upon the principle of Freedom,—all being welcomed on its threshold who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, and are willing to worship and to work in his service on the ground of agreement in spirit, rather than agreement in doctrinal opinion. Whilst strictly a Christian Church, i. e., a Church recognizing the divine authority and mission of Jesus Christ, it is designed to be unsectarian, offering the most cordial and earnest invitation to all who are desirous of manifesting their love to God by their devotion to the best interests of man, all that are anxious to *be* good and to *do* good in the spirit of our common Lord and Master. "We consider diversity of faith," it has been justly remarked, "no bar to Christian communion. We hold conscience to be sacred to God and to the man to whom it belongs. We expect freedom of utterance in the pulpit, and we claim freedom of investigations in the pew. Forswearing all human creeds, we are convinced that the celebrated motto, 'The Bible, and the Bible only, the religion of Protestants,' is capable of an application to which it has not yet been submitted by its most enthusiastic admirers."—*Ham's Chris. Ex. (Eng.)*

———o———

HYMN BOOK.—Our last edition of the "*Christian Psalmody*" was long since exhausted. We have been waiting for months for the arrival of Br. Ham's Hymn Book, from England, which he has sent twice without its ever reaching us. By his *Christian Examiner*, for Oct., we see that he has sent it *again.* We hope it will come safe this time. It is our intention, when it arrives, to add, from it and other sources, some hundred Hymns to the "Christian Psalmody," and publish a new revised edition, without increasing the price. A convenient pocket Hymn Book—well selected—is what we design.

———o———

THE THEOLOGY OF THE BIBLE; OR, *The True Doctrines of the Christian Faith plainly stated and defended; With a Key to the Revelations.* By S. C. Chandler, Independent Minister of the Gospel."

Such is the title of a 12 mo. volume of 408 pages, just issued by the author at No. 8 Spruce-st., N. Y. Our traveling—preaching—publishing—correspondence—getting out Examiner, and various other matters to be attended to, have made it impossible for us to give the work an examination since we received it. We hope to be able to speak more definite of it soon. *Price* $1.

"BIBLE TRUTH DEFENDER: or, *Popular Fables Scripturally Exploded.* By W. Sheldon. Published at *Harbinger* Office, Rochester, N. Y."

This is an 18 mo. pamphlet of 176 pages. Price 20 cents. We have not had time to examine it fully; but judge from what we have read that it is an excellent work. We are glad to see works multiplying on the Life Theme, tho' this work is not wholly on this topic. We do not, of course, in commending any work, commit ourself to all the opinions of the author, nor do we expect any one to do so with ours.

———o———

WARNING VOICE OF TIME AND PROPHECY. By Urjah Smith. Published by James White, Rochester, N. Y.

This work, a copy of which we have received from the author, is a neat 18 mo., bound book, of 116 pages, written in blank verse. The author says—"It is designed to give a general outline of the foundation, rise and progress of the Advent movement up to the present time, showing that it was the work of God; also, its connection with prophecy, and the prophetic fulfillments upon which it was based."

It is written in an attractive form but how well he has succeeded in his object we cannot say, as it has been impossible for us to read it yet, but hope to do so soon.

———o———

"LIFE AND DEATH; or, *The Theology of the Bible in relation to Human Immortality*, by J. Panton Ham, Bristol, Eng." Also, "THE GENERATIONS GATHERED AND GATHERING; or, *The Scripture Doctrine Concerning Man in Death*," by the same author.

We have so often noticed and commended these works that we need say but little now. They should be circulated by tens of thousands. We have put up each of them in a double Examiner, with covers; and sell them at the small sum of *ten cents* per copy; 12 copies for $1, and we pay the postage on them: or, for $7 one hundred copies.

———o———

☞ SOME MEN have the misfortune to misrepresent what their opponents say or do, and build long arguments thereon. We do not accuse them of *wilful* misrepresentation—the Lord is their Judge in that matter—but we choose to have no controversy with such persons, as we should never be likely to come to any understanding with them.—We shall, therefore, pursue that course which we believe God and truth calls us to, and leave them to their own Master. The persons we speak of have attained an eminence, in their own estimation, it seems, above Paul, who said—"*Not* for that we have *dominion* over *your* faith." *These* can "*damn*" a man who does not see and practice as they do.

MEETING IN NEW YORK.—The friends of the *Life Theme*, in this city, have determined to hold meetings statedly every Sabbath; and have commenced in *Mechanics' Hall*, 472 Broadway, above Grand-St. It is a very desirable and central place, easy of access, being on the first floor. Whether they will be able to keep this Hall permanently is not fully determined. We hope it may be so. The Editor of the Examiner preached there the first evening, and will probably preach whenever he is in the city. We hope all the friends will take hold in earnest to sustain this meeting.

———o———

APPOINTMENTS.—We expect to be in Boston the first and second Sundays of this month, and the week intervening. We regret to say, that circumstances seem to forbid our visit to Worcester in Dec., as published in our last. The brethren there will excuse us.

———o———

FROM SISTER JUDSON.

Rochester, N. Y., Oct. 9th, 1853.

BR. STORRS:—What you said with regard to a sectarian spirit, in your late article upon Baptism, I approve, though differing with you in your views upon the latter. Those thoughts suggested the following lines, which I transmit to you. Hoping that we may be led to see *the truth* on all points, as God views it, and at the same time maintain a spirit of love toward those who may differ from us,

I remain, yours, in the faith,

A. C. JUDSON.

SECTARIANISM.

It is a bitter root, and baneful its effects
Upon the human heart—preying upon,
And eating out, though imperceptibly,
The very life of true religion—*Love.*
It giveth an expression to the eye,
Forbidding and severe: and causeth words
To come forth from the lips, as far removed
From that pure gentleness the spirit yields,
As Polar mountains from the burning zone.
There is no virtue in it. Not one spark
Of vital godliness. 'Tis from beneath—
Not from above, where all is light and love;
For it is "earthly, sensual," yea, more,
'Tis "devilish." The very offspring too
Of that old "Serpent," who doth generate
All species of deformity on earth.
Away, then, with the evil. Ye who love
The holy principles of God's blest word,
And to the truthful pattern there inscrib'd,
Desire to bear resemblance, turn away
As from a pois'nous viper. Use no more
Your "Sibboleth's," or rods, or measuring lines,
But make the law, that perfect *law of love*—
The testing point—standard of fellowship.
So shall ye flourish, like the bay-tree, green
And freshly watered—and the word of life
Like rivers flow unfetter'd, while the Lord
Himself shall be well pleased and honored too.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VIII. NEW YORK, DECEMBER, 1853. NO. 12.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 140 Fulton-street, (Up Stairs.)

TERMS.--Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

ÆTERNITAS REVIEWED.

BY REV. WM. G. MONCRIEFF.

"ÆTERNITAS: *or, Glimpes of the Future Destinies of Man.* B. Wm. Bathgate."

[Continued from page 118.]

"Assures them they are mortals, and next line
Calls them immortals, angels and divine;
Declares them spirits, and yet sons of clay,
Who death survive and yet in death decay;
Exposed to anguish in the quenchless fire,
Whose flames destroy and leave the wretch entire;
Such contradictions are abundant here,
But, God be thanked, none in the Word appear.
ANON.

AFTER the evidence given in our last article of this series, bearing upon the points, what is a Soul? and that all breathing creatures on earth are souls, —evidence drawn directly from the volume of truth and requiring no laborious efforts to show its validity, it seems to be almost a waste of time to follow the author through the remaining portions of his book, which are all based upon the rotten foundations composed of the antiquated and popular assumptions concerning souls and their inherent properties. To hang immortality on the fact that man is a soul, is like suspending a pyramid by a straw. Every argument based on the appellative "*soul*" in favor of man's inherent deathlessness, is as applicable to the sparrow and the crab-fish. It won't do to reason in this way longer,—men are getting enlightened, and old orthodoxy is at a discount.

With his stately assumptions about souls, our author's future labor in his treatise is comparatively easy; having fixed his line, he runs out with it in a triumphant spirit. It becomes the province of the critic to point out the illegality of the first act, and to show reason why he ought to lay down the bow, and quit the field. He is trespassing on forbidden ground, and, in a friendly spirit, we must deal with him regarding the impropriety and danger of his conduct.

This brings us to that section of *Æternitas* in which we are informed that "the *certainty* of a future state, and the *fact* of the immortality of the human soul, are established by proofs, drawn from the records of a supernatural theology." p. 57. We are tempted to prolong our analysis of the work that the reader may see how vain it is to attempt to bolster up the perishing dogma of soul-immortality by sacred Scripture. The loud tramp of the argumentation seems to indicate power, but the whole promise is early disappointed. Of this the intelligent reader shall speedily judge for himself.

Introducing his proof in the high style we have indicated above, one is greeted, in a few lines on, with the following words, in a key that has undergone a great humiliation. He says, "In specifying the nature of the Scriptural evidence which certifies the doctrine of immortality, it ought, in fairness to be stated, that the Holy Spirit more frequently *assumes* than *asserts* the doctrine." p. 58. No doubt if it be asserted with any degree of frequency, we may expect it often to be assumed in the sacred pages; but without controversy, in the absence of express declaration, to speak about assumptions would be utterly inadmissible. Plain assertions we must have, and the man who promises them and fails to afford them, is not fit to be a public instructor. The words we have quoted lead us to expect an array of passages belonging to the two-fold division of assumption and assertion, and if we get plenty of those asserting, we are not concerned if the other order be withheld. But the assertions we must have, and since they are declared to be in the Volume, we shall surely see them by and by. Preparing the way, as it seems to us, for the approaching manifestations of the absolute want of all evidence in Scripture in support of his favorite tenet, we find it remarked:—"There are many other points of the highest interest, which are rather *assumed* than *asserted*. For example, in no part of the Scriptures is it formally revealed, that man possesses so many intellectual faculties or so many moral feelings. The rational nature of man is to be inferred from the very significant circumstance, that communications, such as can be made to a rational being alone, are made to him." p. 58. In addition to the consideration mentioned by the author in confirmation of the very simple statement, that there is no express revelation given to man as to his rational and moral nature, there is a prior and sufficient reply in this, that he is *conscious* of possessing both these attributes, and the Bible had no more need to inform him of them, than of his having hands, and eyes, and feet, and existence itself. We expect the Book to make known what is beyond consciousness and the reach of our unaided powers. We look for it to disclose all that is essential to our position as members of the Divine government, as the subjects of future judgment, and as the heirs of, or candidates for interminable duration of being. From consciousness we can discover nothing as to how long this existence we have received from God shall last; inasmuch as consciousness relates to the present and its experiences. We cannot be conscious of the past or future. We may be conscious of recollecting what is gone, and of expecting what is to come, but to

speak of having a consciousness, as some do, that we will live for ever, is to use words that are palpably incorrect. Again, to suppose that we can learn from reason that we are immortal is equally fallacious, and the impossibility of reaching such a conclusion by our own faculties, evinces the need of explicit affirmations that no believer in Scripture would question for a moment. Appearances are all against the conclusion that we do not expire in death, and that we shall resume conscious existence posterior to that mournful crisis. Shall we infer that we are immortal because we are now in being? Shall we conceive that that event introduces us to a new life, destined to have no end, which assuredly seems to terminate being for ever? Shall we argue that the powers we have indicate undoubtedly that this is but the dawn of our God-like duration? Thus we may reason, and thus many have tried to build up the hope of immortality, but with nothing better to construct the fabric, it is one airy as the dreams of a drugged imagination. Something plain, unambiguous, full and authoritative is needed to hold up the doctrine that man is an heir of immortality. On other momentous points the Word gives us ample satisfaction, and on this one we expect most reasonably no less confirming and consoling information.

Drawing nearer to the point, when the evidence that is to solve all questionings, and ratify the teachings of the creed, the author presents what a dim eye can discover to be thoroughly fallacious.—He writes,—"The Bible does not communicate the attributes of rationality or immortality, but is framed *for* rational and immortal beings, informing them of their duties, privileges, and destinies,—all the while taking it for granted, that we no more need to be formally or minutely told of our intellectual, moral, or *immortal* nature, ere we can turn the contents of the Scriptures to a practical account, than we require to be distinctly told we have feet, ere we employ them in walking, or that we have tongues ere we employ them in speaking." p. 59. Alas, there is but small hope of Bible evidence for man's immortality after lines like these; they are a gentle, we doubt not, an unconscious effort to prepare his friendly readers for the great gulph they will by and by see. He promised ample and convincing evidence lately, now he tells us in so many words we are foolish to expect it. Expect plain assertions that you are immortal!—as well look for explicit intimations that you have eyes to see with, and hands to hold by! This may pass with some, it won't do with us, and thousands more.—That the Bible is formed for rational beings, is implied in its very existence, for surely no volume was needed by the birds and trees and fishes. But that it was prepared for immortal beings, is a point that is not necessarily implied in its existence, since surely a message might come to intelligent creatures who were not immortal, but who were summoned in its pages to seek for glory, honor and immortality. Is it irrational to suppose that God might address men as candidates for immortality? The Bible might be useful to immortals, is it useful to address mortals who may, by following a divinely appointed course, ascend to the heights of endless being? Immortal creatures would have "their duties, privileges, and destinies;" but mortal beings, in the circumstances we have supposed, would have their duties, privileges, and destinies, concerning which they would need to be enlightened also. That there could be or would be no Bible unless men were immortal, is the grossest misunderstanding of the plainest point that could engage the humblest capacities. As we have already declared, we require no supernatural communications to assure us we could reason and had moral faculties, since these are matter of indisputable consciousness; but what relation have we to the future? must we, or *may* we live for ever? Is the event we call death the end of all, as far as we are concerned? These are the points we need to have cleared up, since unless by the Spirit of God they are illuminated, there is no other mode of reaching the knowledge that is so momentous. It is affirmed by the author that the Bible is framed for "rational and immortal beings;" and of course we will get ample evidence that such is the case, as he develops his argument. As we observed on a former occasion, we would naturally expect to find the doctrine laid down expressly on almost every page of the Word, for there is scarcely a religious volume sent from the press like the one before us, but teems with "immortal souls" and "immortal man." We are near the spot now, when the promised Scriptural *assertions* must be given, and truth and error are thus near a conflict. They have often met before, and we wait the issue of the contest in peace and hope.

In the course of the existing controversy, it has again and again been demanded on this side the Atlantic and on yon one, that if there is one plain assertion in all the Bible on the point of man's immortality, that it should be produced for our enlightenment and confutation. Thousands have heard the request, and surely it is a reasonable one. What less can we solicit? what less could our opponents grant us? They are bold in affirming men are immortal beings, we ask the warrant for the statement? Our author says, it ought to be stated in fairness that "the Holy Spirit more frequently *assumes* than *asserts* the doctrine." If it is more frequently assumed, it must be *frequently asserted*; this is a legitimate conclusion. Has it been asked for years that one explicit statement to the effect should be presented, and after all are texts of this nature frequently to be found in the Book? Were men so foolish as to call for *one*, when any individual with eyes in his head, could see them by dozens? Have we been unconsciously playing the part not merely of fools, but of something worse? That can scarcely be believed by us, for the question has been uttered by those who are conscious of reverence for God, who have studied His Word and are anxious to understand its contents. Explain the matter as we please we have never got one plain passage, and the author of this volume says there are many! Was he destined to discover what innumerable eyes could not find within the sacred enclosure? It is far from probable, but we will learn ere long.

He continues:—

"A portion of Sacred truth explicitly asserting the immortality of the soul is frequently demanded by those who call in question our immortality, and that demand is made in tones which indicate the spirit of the challenger, who is confident that there is not one passage which can be produced as worthy of a hearing. Now, although it were true, (which is not the case,) that this high doctrine is

based only on the assumptions of the Omniscient spirit, our faith in the doctrine would be as unwavering as if human immortality were fifty times most unequivocally asserted in the Word of God. But there is at least ONE remarkable passage in which the doctrine is taught, not by indubitable inference, but by undubious assertion. We refer to Luke 20 : 27–38 :—'Then came to him certain of the Sadducees, which deny that there is any resurrection ; and they asked him, saying, Master, Moses wrote unto us, If any man's brother die, having a wife, and he die without children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. There were therefore seven brethren, and the first took a wife and died without children.—And the second took her to wife and he died childless. And the third took her; and in like manner the seven also: and they left no children and died. Last of all the woman died also. Therefore, in the resurrection, whose wife of them is she? for seven had her to wife. And Jesus answering, said unto them, the children of this world marry and are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels: and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Now, that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he called the Lord, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead but of the living: for all live unto him.' Of course the assertion of immortality is contained in these words, 'NEITHER CAN THEY DIE ANY MORE.' A dispute is raised as to the parties of whom the Savior says that they cannot die again. On the one side it is said that Christ attributes to all mankind the destiny of immortality; on the other side, it is argued that he limits the possession of immortality to the saved. Let us candidly look at the context preceding and succeeding." pp. 59, 60.

It is not our intention to enter on an examination of this passage at present; our space is too far gone to allow us to do justice to it. We shall make it, along with the author's connected reasoning, the subject of our next article, when his deliverances will be subjected to a full and searching scrutiny. In the meantime we commend the quotation we have given to the reader's diligent study; and we are inclined to think he will be confounded, as we have been, to see the words of the Saviour made to teach what manifestly they were never designed to inculcate. The passage was given by Mr. Bathgate to demonstrate the immortality of the human soul, and the word soul is not in it;—the passage was announced to us as being an "undubious assertion," a plain, unequivocal affirmation of "our immortality," and after all it turns out to be one needing to be defended at great length, one out of which no such sense comes freely and naturally, but which must be crushed and twisted ere it even has the appearance of yielding the dogma! But we must not enlarge at present.

"There is at least *one* remarkable passage in which the doctrine (of human immortality) is taught by undubious assertion,"—one passage, one solitary passage in the great volume of truth! One passage! the words are beggarly and deplorable.—That man is immortal, only once affirmed by the Holy Spirit! Never was there a more humiliating confession. After all the promise in the extracts formerly quoted, is it to end in this? Our author's volume has been applauded to the skies as a defence of orthodoxy, and it has but one place to point where the foot can stand, and that one of questionable solidity indeed! Where are the *frequent* assertions? We expected them anxiously, they are undiscoverable, and instead of many, we have ONE! On this one hangs the immortality of our race—the ceaseless torments of the damned—and the horrors of relentless retribution. Archimedes was wont to say that if he had a spot whereon to fix his engines, he would lift the globe: this writer has found one spot to operate upon, and whether he shall move the so-called portentious heresy of *conditional immortality*, and *no eternal misery*, remains to be discovered.

(*To be Continued.*)

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS.

THE FACTS AND PHENOMENA OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

(*Continued from page* 165.)

With the view of marking the historic facts and phenomena connected with the final sufferings and death of the Lord Jesus Christ, we followed his hallowed footsteps from the place, where, with his disciples, he partook of the last social meal, and gave that meal its memorable spiritual significance, to his lonely and much beloved retirement in Gethsemane, the scene of his almost mortal agony.—With the same pious inquisitiveness we joined the weeping multitude on the road, since celebrated as the *Via Dolorosa*, and pondered the tender-hearted but significant words addressed to those weepers. Now we gather with the group at Golgotha,—gloomy Golgotha—"the place of a skull." The Son of the Highest is about to be hanged on a Roman gibbet, at the guilty bidding of a proud and powerful priesthood. We mark the wonderful meekness of the great Sufferer's deportment,—"He is led as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep dumb before her shearers, so he opened not his mouth." The hands of the hangman have made him fast. The feet that went about on errands of mercy, and were so often wearied,—the hands that were wont to help, and to heal, and hold bread to the hungry, are now transfixed, and torn with nails. Exquisite torment racks his already enfeebled frame, as the feverish blood drains from the cruel wounds. The insult of scoffs and mocking is added to this dreadful outrage against the Christ of God, but no revengeful response comes from the lips of the great sufferer,—they are opened on the cross, not to curse, but to call to heaven for compassion,—compassion not for himself, but for his murderers! "*Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.*"

We pause at this new phenomenon, not, indeed, as we profitably might, to dwell on its moral grandeur, but to study its doctrinal indications, and examine it in the view of a theological theory. The prayer on the cross, like other phenomenal incidents already noticed, cannot be reconciled with the theory against which we contend. Contrasts

the most conflicting present themselves in the effort to estimate this benignant prayer co-existently with the current ideas on the nature and design of the crucifixion. Possibly, some of our readers have not been accustomed to ponder these moral and historic phenomena from the particular stand-point which we invite them to occupy; but, no doubt, they will at once see its propriety, and give this aspect of the inquiry all the consideration which its obvious importance demands. By pursuing this mode of investigation, we are selecting a more special and convincing mode of argumentation than that commonly adopted by the defenders of the popular theory, who seem instinctively to shrink from particulars, to bewilder themselves and their readers in the mazes of abstract and general disquisitions about law and moral government. The argument deduced from plain matters of fact and incidental phenomena is worth all abstract theories together. Requesting, then, our readers to bear in mind what has already been advanced, we proceed to add to this class of evidence, the testimony derived from our Lord's prayer for his murderers,—"Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

This prayer implies that our Lord's crucifiers were guilty of a great crime against God. Now it is an essential principle of the popular theory of expiation, that all sin needs a moral satisfaction, and that such satisfaction can only be had by allowing retributive justice to take its course, either in punishing the sinner himself, or a substitute. But is it not clear that the prayer of Christ takes no account of any such principle? Does he not actually set it aside by asking for *forgiveness*, which is a *gratuitous act of mercy?* "Father, *forgive* them," is the prayer he offers,—as if he had said, "Take not vengeance on their sins,—pass by their great transgression,—let not retributive justice take its course, —spare them for thy *mercy's* sake." Such is evidently the force of this prayer. That it should have been offered by Jesus *at such a time* adds considerably to its significance and argumentive value. *At that time*, Christ, it is said, was expiating the world's sins, and experiencing the bitter anguish which an inexorable justice made imperative should be endured. To ask for *forgiveness then*, exhibits an unaccountable disregard of this stern law of retribution; and coming from the lips of the great Expiator in the very hour of his expiation, could only conceal from the spectators of the crucifixion the real moral significance of those sufferings, and confound all future readers of the record.—Here are discrepancies which we are persuaded no theological ingenuity can reconcile. To say, as is commonly said, that Christ offered his prayer in reference to the expiation he was then making, is a mere quibble,—an invention to escape a difficulty. It is sufficient to reply, that Christ asked for *forgiveness*, which excludes such an antagonistic idea as that of *expiation*. If justice has taken its retributive course, and received a full satisfaction, then there is no room for the gratuity of *forgiveness*.

But, it may be observed, further, in opposition to the doctrine of expiation, that this prayer on the cross, in the view of the popular theory, exhibits a singular *contrast of disposition and principle* between Christ and his Father. No truth is more emphatically asserted in Scripture than the *oneness* of Christ and his Father,—"I and my Father are one." Whatever else may be involved in this idea of oneness, it is undoubted that it involves a unity of principle and purpose,—a unity of character and acts. It is such a moral unity as was expressed by our Lord when he said, "He that hath *seen me* hath *seen the Father*." But on the cross, the theory of the popular churches represents Christ as the voluntary and compassionate victim of an equally voluntary and inexorable vengeance. Christ is placed by this theory in direct and advantageous *contrast* with God, and under such lamentable tuition mankind have not been slow to mark the difference. The compassion is *felt* to be all on Christ's side, and hence many draw near to Christ as the shield and safeguard against the vindictiveness of God, whom their imaginations clothe in the attributes of an Avenger. They can trust Christ, but before God they tremble. Alas! how greatly does this doctrine of expiation dishonor God, and damage his benignant influence over his creatures! Give the world to understand that Christ's sufferings on the cross were the appointment of God, and involved an infinite agony of punishment which he would not remit because inconsistent with his perfections, and the world will see a *contrast* of personal perfections in the suffering One when he sought to avert vengeance from his murderers by asking for *gratuitous pardon*. The prayer, "Father, *forgive* them, for they know not what they do," will develop to their apprehensions a character of higher perfections than that which the Father is represented as developing—a character which, it is their nature, much more to love and admire. The perfections of God, instead of being glorified by this so-called orthodox theory, are miserably and mischievously distorted; his benign influence over his creatures is hereby nullified through the operation of an unconquerable dread; he is represented in disadvantageous contrast with the Lord Jesus Christ; and the unity between the Father and the Son is manifestly destroyed. Such are some of the mischiefs of popular "orthodoxy." How painful is the contrast between Christ and his Father which this false theology obliges us to recognize, as we listen to the prayer on the cross! Wrath to the uttermost is represented as streaming forth from the ireful bosom of God on the meek sufferer, while in the sufferer himself, the tenderest compassion is expressing itself in intercessory prayer. The scene on which we are bidden by the popular churches to gaze, shocks severely our moral sensibilities. It is that of an incensed God, and an interceding Christ,—an exacting God, and a forgiving Christ,—an inexorable God, and a lenient and merciful Christ? Who can see a *unity* between a God punishing sin to the uttermost, and a Christ praying for a full and gratuitous pardon? The theology which represents God as an Avenger of Sin in the agonies of Christ's crucifixion, sadly distorts and damages the Divine character. We cannot subscribe to it without offering a high insult to the majesty and mercifulness of God, and placing in painful contrast to Him the spirit and principle of his Son concerning whom it is declared that he is "*the express image of his person*," and to have seen whom is to have "seen the Father."

The inconsistency of the alleged circumstances of the case with our Lord's prayer on the cross is yet further apparent, when we reflect on the position which the crucifiers of Christ occupied. The popular theory requires us to regard our Lord's

crucifiers as *the Ministers of Divine Justice* appointed to execute on him the terrible sentence of the violated law. The Roman soldiers then, and all who had anything to do with the crucifixion, were fulfilling a highly important and necessary work. Had not they, or some others, nailed Christ to the cross, no expiation of the world's sins would have been made, and according the commonly received opinions, the world would have been unredeemed, and its salvation impossible. The crucifiers then were discharging an official and imperative duty. They were doing an act which would result in the highest glory to God, and the greatest good to mankind. By their act, Justice would withdraw its uncompromising opposition, and Mercy would issue forth with unhindered march to pardon and save men. The law of God, we are assured, received a lustre from the crucifixion of Christ far beyond what it could have received, had mankind never sinned, and the satisfaction had never been offered. Then, WHY, we ask, *did Christ pray to his Father to* FORGIVE *his crucifiers?* In view of the Lord Jesus himself, these men must have been *great criminals* needing even his intercession, to shelter them from the merited displeasure of God. The proof of their criminality is furnished in the fact, that they needed *forgiveness.* There is some significance in the circumstance that Christ added to his prayer in their behalf, the words, "*they know not what they do,*" and that he assigned this ignorance of theirs as the reason why they should be forgiven. "Father, forgive them, *for they know not what they do.*" Now, if these men were doing what we are told they were, namely, executing on Christ the judgments of God's retributive law, the fact that they were ignorant of what they were about, could not alter the value and importance of their service, and be a reason for asking forgiveness for them. Will any of our brethren affirm, that *if they had known* what they were doing, *they would not have needed any forgiveness?* It is very evident that if they had known what they were doing, they would have been vastly more guilty in our Lord's opinion, and that their ignorance of whom they were putting to death, was the only plausible extenuation of their crime. The *logical*, though anti-scriptural, conclusion of the popular theory of the crucifixion, is, that the crucifiers, because of their official position as the executioners of Divine Justice, were guilty of no crime, and needed no forgiveness. Such a logical conclusion, Mr. D'Israeli, as we have before shown, unhesitatingly comes to. He, although a disciple of the orthodox theology, asks, "*Could that be a* CRIME *which secured for all mankind eternal joy? Which vanquished Satan, and opened the gates of Paradise? Such a tenet,*" he says, "*would sully and impugn the doctrine that is the corner-stone of our faith and hope.*" It *was* "a crime," we reply, and abundant proof may be brought from Scripture to demonstate its criminality. This one fact, that Christ prayed for the *forgiveness* of his crucifiers, is amply sufficient proof; and if "such a tenet" really does "sully and impugn the doctrine" which, Mr. D'Israeli, speaking for himself and his co-religionists, says, "is the corner-stone of our faith and hope," then let it "sully and impugn" the unscriptural "doctrine," for it is the "corner-stone" of a false "faith," and a most vain and delusive "hope."—That it does "impugn" the so-called orthodox theology is clear enough, and it rests with the advocates of the popular theology to decide whether they will adhere to a speculative system, which is manifestly at variance with the facts on which that system is professedly founded.

The solemnity and world-wide importance of such a judicial execution as the crucifixion of Christ, is declared to be, would, we should reasonably expect, secure for it a distinctness and prominence which should make its misapprehension absolutely impossible. Christ, we should expect, to appear in *the unmistakable attitude of the substitute for a guilty world;* God, to give most *significant evidence* that he was present there as *the Avenger of the sins of men;* and the crucifiers to be *distinctly identified as the appointed Executioners* of the Divine retributive law. All the details of this most eventful occasion would need to stand out in the boldest relief, that every beholder of the awful scene might apprehend, and unhesitatingly acknowledge its significance. But, who can discover any such distinctness? Who, but the thoroughly trained theologue, can find in the historic facts such an alleged significance? The facts are patent enough, but the farthest stretch of fancy cannot put them into that forensic form which the popular theology claims for them. Had the theology of our Lord's death been formed from the due consideration of the *history* of that fact, and all its accompanying phenomena, no such tortuous task had ever been set the world. The evangelic history has been wholly disregarded in the formation of this false theology, and now it is boldly defied by it. Prejudice has purblinded the mind to the most palpable facts; hence these historic facts need to be put into the foreground of utmost prominence, and we have no fear, if this be done, of arresting the popular eye, and convincing the popular judgment. So far as we have proceeded in this direction of our inquiry, we have failed to discover the faintest traces of a judicial character in the crucifixion of Christ; but, on the contrary, the clearest evidences that no such character can belong to it. All the historic phenomena of that awful event protest against any such construction. Even the prayer on the cross has a virtual and emphatic protest to utter against a scheme of doctrine, which, notwithstanding the prestige of a considerable antiquity, is as antagonistic to our intelligence as it is to the clearly revealed principles, and historic phenomena of Scripture.

(*To be Continued.*)

SECTARIANISM.

We were just on the point of writing an article on this anti-christian spirit—feeling deeply that it is needed—when Br. Moncrieff's *Expositor* came to hand with the following excellent article on "*The True Test of Christian Discipleship.*" We commend it to the careful attention of all; especially to such as seem to be fast growing out of the spirit of that Christian liberty for which they contended when they left those organizations where they felt the bondage of sectarianism. It is painful to see how fast that unchristian spirit has grown in the past few months among those from whom we

expected better things. May God forgive them, and lead them to see that "one is our Master, even Christ, and all we are brethren." "*By this* shall all men know that ye are my disciples if ye have *love* one to another," said Jesus. And to one, who found a person "casting out devils in Christ's name, and forbade him because he followeth not us," Jesus said, "*forbid him not.*" Let the following remarks be pondered in view of Jesus' words; and let the *imported* sectarianism which has so recently shown itself be compelled to hide its deformed head; and may it "*die the death.*"

"Were the question, what constitutes a person a disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ? by what marks is his christianity to be determined? put to the various societies distinguished by the appellation of christians, what a host of conflicting answers might we expect to receive! Very probably we should find their replies not less varied and contradictory in character, than multitudinous in number: each sect would return a verdict different from, if not directly opposed to, every other sect. Yet, notwithstanding this distressingly conflicting variety in their decision, it would, at the same time, present a oneness or similarity. The testimony of each contending sect would amount to this,—"That man is to be regarded as a Christian who believes what we believe." And it is this similarity in their verdict that renders it so bewildering, for, the confusion is, none of them believe alike.

"Turn we, then, to the 'Law and to the Testimony,' we shall find that the marks of true discipleship consist not in *opinion* but in *practice;* in other words, the Bible teaches us to discern our brethren in Christ, not by their creed but by their CHARACTER. 'By their fruits ye shall know them;' 'ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you;' 'by this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.' The justified by faith 'have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.' Those who are in Christ Jesus 'walk not after the flesh but after the spirit;' *i. e.*, their deportment is characterized by such sentiments as love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, faith, meekness, and temperance (see Gal. 5: 22, 23). To sum up all, they have the spirit of Christ. The inspired record assures us, that if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his; consequently, all who have the disposition of Jesus belong to him. The feelings of our Divine brother toward God and man have been beautifully manifested during his pilgrimage on earth; and may be described in such terms as the following: Unflinching obedience to his Father's will; unwearied effort for the weal of man. Unsullied piety towards God; unbroken love to the human race. A perfect abhorrence of sin; and the tenderest pity for the sinner. Blessing all men, and with latest breath; amid the most shameful, painful, and unmerited sufferings, pleading pardon for his merciless murderers. To sum up all, he had PERFECT LOVE TO GOD AND PERFECT LOVE TO MAN.

"Such is the spirit of Christ, and by the manifestation of the same feelings are his disciples to be distinguished. Not that every follower of the Lamb possesses these dispositions in the same degree as Jesus, but they have these qualities of mind to such an extent, as to be distinguished by them.—The germ of true godliness has taken root in their minds, and their highest ambition is to arrive at the 'measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.'

"It is a notorious fact, that a man may believe any of the creeds of the sects, and still remain destitute of the spirit of Christ; it is also true that a man may believe or disbelieve any of these creeds, and yet possess like dispositions with the Saviour. It therefore follows, that we should regard, as our brethren in Christ, all who have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; whose main desire is to glorify God, to learn and obey his will, so far as they understand it. We should test them, not by the resemblance of their opinions, but by the likeness of their conduct to Christ's.

"The folly of testing men's piety by their peculiar beliefs must appear evident, when we reflect that God alone is the proper judge of men's thoughts and opinions,—He alone is infallible. The best of men have had imperfect views of divine truth, and are daily changing their opinions; and, until we arrive at infallibility, we have no right to exclude a man from our fellowship, simply because he sees some Bible doctrine in a different light than we do.

"Yet this presumptive intolerant system of trying men's christianity by their creed, reigns rampant throughout the whole Christian world.—Wherever we turn our eyes, we see it manifesting itself in the form of petty bickerings and fierce disputes, excommunicatings, splits, and an increase of sects; and the worst feature of it is, that no sooner is a new sect formed, than, notwithstanding all their complaints against the tyranny and uncharitableness manifested in their expulsion, no sooner are they constituted a church, than they begin to exercise authority over the minds of any of their number who have learned a little faster, or, it may be, a little slower than themselves; and then we have another excommunicating, or another split, and so the separations go on till total ruin sets the splitters at rest.

"Difference of opinion among Christians, regarding spiritual truth, during the present state of things, appears to us inevitable. Where freedom of thought is exercised, and a variety of mind exists, the more active and vigorous intellect must make greater progress in the discernment of truth, than one of an opposite character; while both alike may be anxious to learn and obey the will of God.—Love, guided by reason, will lead us to judge that, while many pious individuals do not think on many points as we do, this is not because they love God less, or are less willing to do His will, but simply because their convictions are different from ours.—In the spirit of love and fidelity, we should try to persuade them to the adoption of what we think right. Should we fail in this, being convinced of their attachment to Christ, still let us esteem them as brethren, cheerfully walking together so far as we are agreed.

"Acting under this idea, Paul enjoined the brethren at Corinth to 'receive him who was weak in the faith; and not subject him to doubtful disputations,' but to 'follow after peace, and things by which they might edify one another." 'Twas with the same feelings that the Great Teacher bore with

the ignorance and stupidity of those disciples more immediately under his care and instruction; and to whom he primarily addressed his new commandments,—a command equally binding on us, and his followers in all ages,—'Love one another, as I have loved you.'—W. L."

FROM T. PENDLETON.

Westerly, R. I., Nov. 16, 1853.

BR. STORRS:—It is now forty years since I embraced the Christian religion; and from that time until I was 33 years old, which was about 20 years, I thought much on the prevailing doctrine of the end of the wicked. That doctrine and some other things almost drove me to infidelity. To express my views of the doctrine I was brought up to believe, and its horribleness, I will illustrate by a figure in part. Suppose a girl at the age of 16 years dies in an unprepared state. She might not be guilty of any outbreaking sins; yet she goes to an eternal place of conscious torment. When as many millions of years have passed away as would take a bird to carry off a bulk of sand as large as our earth, and be ten thousand years in carrying one grain at a time; when all that vast length of time should have passed away, her sufferings would be just begun, according to the popular theory!—O, my dear brother, may the God of the universe bless you and dear Br. Grew, in trying to persuade men that such is not the doctrine of the precious Bible. It is a doctrine that drives men to infidelity out of the church, and influences men in the church to *act* infidelity.

In regard to my embracing the Bible views on this subject, I was living in the city of Middletown, Ct., at that time, about 20 years since. I did not know of but one or two in the universe who believed as I now do; and with them I never had more than 15 minutes conversation upon any subject whatever. I was in that city all alone. By chance I heard some of the popular preachers preach from the words in Phil. 3: 18, 19. These verses state that the *end* of the wicked is *destruction;* and he tried to make out that the wicked had *no end.*—His sermon led me to much reflection upon the subject, earnest searching the Scriptures, and prayer to Almighty God for light and direction. After six months had elapsed I came out and committed myself on that subject; and now that twenty years have passed I feel that the arguments for endless existence in torment do not move me any more than a faning breeze would the Rock of Gibralter.

Yours, TAYLOR PENDLETON.

FROM JAS. L. MATHEWSON.

Montreal, (Canada,) Oct. 27, 1853.

GEO. STORRS:—*Sir:*—I have been for a long time a disbeliever of the doctrine of natural immortality, but it was only lately that I became aware of the great extent to which a similar disbelief prevailed in the United States, and of the important part you have taken in the question. The notice to preach, which appeared in some of the religious papers, last week, gave me great pleasure as indicating your purpose to bring the subject more prominently before the public. I had serious thoughts myself, before I was aware that you had done so of publishing Ham's two volumes, and inserting an advertisement similar to the one now enclosed, in every religious paper in the country. The list of contents is most inviting, and could not fail to excite great attention. The proper means have not yet been tried either here or in England of bringing the question prominently before the religious public, and there are none more effectual than by advertising in *all* these papers. Would the "*Observer*" admit one? Yours, respectfully,

JAS. L. MATHEWSON.

BIBLICAL *versus* SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY.

Just published, a Second Edition, with Additions. Cloth, price 2s.

LIFE AND DEATH; or, The Theology of the Bible in Relation of Human Immortality. By the Rev. J. PANTON HAM, Cooper's-hall, Congregational Church, Bristol.

CONTENTS.

Lecture 1.—The Edenic Dispensation.
Lecture 2.—The Christian Redemption.
Lecture 3.—The Future Retribution.
Appendix.

Also, by the same Author, price 2s., cloth.

THE GENERATIONS GATHERED AND GATHERING; or, the Scripture Doctrine Concerning Man in Death.

CONTENTS.

Sect. 1.—Introduction.
Sect. 2.—Terms denoting the Locality of the Dead.
Sect. 3.—Scripture Descriptions of the State of the Dead.
Sect. 4.—Christ's Miracles on the Dead.
Sect. 5.—Christ's Discourses Concerning the Dead.
Sect. 6.—Apostolic Doctrine do do do
Sect. 7.—Implied and Doubtful Allusions to the Dead.
Sect. 8.—Practical Importance of the Doctrine of the Dead.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"A learned and ingenious argument to prove that the immortality of the soul is not only unwarranted by Scripture, but is altogether unscriptural. ....The arguments of Mr. Ham are drawn from Scripture, arranged under the appropriate heads.—The 'Generations Gathered' is a curious book on a curious subject."—*Spectator.*

"I seems to us a reverent and sincere spirited book, and as such entitled to attention and respect, even from such as may withhold assent."—*Nonconformist.*

"The work is written in a philosophical and Christian spirit."—*Bristol Examiner.*

London: HOULSTON and STONEMAN, and LONGMANS; Bristol: EVANS and ABBOTT.

The foregoing is the English advertisement referred to in the preceding letter from Montreal.

These works we have often spoken of, and re-

published in two double Examiners, and put them at the low price of *ten cents* single copy, or $7 per 100, sent at our expense. We now offer to mail the two copies *without charge* to any *Clergyman* in the United States, who shall inform us that he will read them. Who will work now to see how many *theologians* will accept our offer, which is worth more than many whole libraries of theological *guess-work*. Here they have the *Bible* and not *Traditions*. Again we say, Let them be scattered through the land. Address

"GEO. STORRS, *New York.*"

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, DECEMBER, 1853.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—This number completes the volume for 1853. We thank our friends for the aid they have afforded us, enabling us to go on thus far without pecuniary embarrassment. Our subscribers have not been *dunned* for dues, because most of them owe us nothing. They are thankful for this we know. Our terms of "*payment in advance*" have been pretty uniformly complied with, and all may be assured that if we send the Examiner without *pre*-payment we have no intention of upbraiding you with not having paid for it. Our uniform rule is to *discontinue* all papers at the end of the volume when the following volume is not paid for, unless in *special* cases. If any one does not receive the Examiner for 1854, he may understand that we have not received pay according to terms. If any, however, should not receive it who suppose themselves entitled to it, let us know immediately, stating the facts, and we will make it right. Money enclosed in a *sealed* letter, for the Examiner, and sent us by mail, is at our risk, if directed plainly, "GEO. STORRS, *New York*;" but do not think you must write "*money letter*," or anything indicating that there is money in it; that only increases the danger of a miscarriage, in these days.

—

The proposition for next year is as follows:

1. If we receive one thousand dollars by Dec. 25th, from subscribers or otherwise, we will publish the Examiner *twice* each month at $1 per year.

2. Or, if fifteen hundred *paying* subscribers are secured by January first, at $2 per year, then we will publish it *weekly*.

3. If neither of the previous propositions are met, then we shall go on *monthly* as heretofore; but any person who pays $1, prior to Dec. 25th, shall be entitled to a copy of Br. Blain's new work—"*Death not Life*,"—*without charge*; they paying the postage. This offer applies *only* in case of the Examiner being published *monthly*.

—

The prospect of a *semi-monthly* issue is at present favorable; and if all would act as promptly as some have done, the matter would soon be settled. But a delay in acting may defeat the object. Let all who intend helping, do it *at once*. Remember, *this* month must decide the matter; and it is our friends who must decide it. So far, we have received *double* the amount for the Examiner we had last year at the same time. This is encouraging. One simultaneous action would settle it in three weeks. *It can be done. Shall it be?*

The Examiner will continue to be devoted to the *Life Theme*, or, to "*Life and Immortality only through Jesus Christ.*" We intend to give a reasonable space to other topics; but the one mentioned is that for which the paper was first started, and to which we have been enabled to keep, through all the stormy winds that have howled around us.—That we should please all we never expected; but we are conscious that we have labored to treat all kindly; tho' in this we may have sometimes failed: may the Lord forgive us.

The year past has been one of much labor, travel and preaching; so that we have not been able to write as much as in some previous years. How it may be the coming one we cannot say, except that we intend no effort shall be lacking on our part to make the Examiner both interesting and profitable. We have passed through our share of trials since the year commenced, but have also had many comforts and blessings. The cause of "*Life through Christ*" has certainly advanced greatly, or else we much misjudge. There is a greater interest on the subject now than ever heretofore. The work of Dr. McCulloh, of Baltimore, has had a mighty influence in some high places. "The Bible vs. Tradition" is mowing a wide swath through the *traditions of men*. "Death not Life," comes on in the train, regardless of the many attempts to turn "*switches*" to run us off the track. Various other smaller works have appeared to help on. The laborers in proclaiming these truths are increasing. The Lord has blessed all these efforts: *to Him be all the praise and glory.*

Shall we hear from all who intend to continue the Examiner immediately? We hope so. Do not wait for somebody to call on you, but enclose *your money* in a letter and send it to us at once. Then we shall know how to begin the new year. No subscription is received for less than one volume.

The Examiner for '52 and '53, *bound* in one volume will be ready for delivery in a few days. Price $1,50. Those who wish for it should send

immediately, as only a limited number can be supplied. The numbers, *bound*, for '50 and '51, in one volume, can also be had at the same price.

———o———

VISIT TO BOSTON.—We spent the first and second Sundays in November, and the week intervening in Boston, and preached nine times in Chapman Hall—the same place where we held meetings in that city, last March. We found there had been a growing interest in that vicinity since that time, so that our meeting now opened with a much larger assembly than at our previous visit; and numbers came from far to be present. The intervening week was rainy, and the last Sunday was stormy throughout. Notwithstanding, more were out to hear than we anticipated. The works on the *Life* theme were much called for; and all the "Bible vs. Tradition," and "Death not Life," that we had there, were disposed of, and more wanted before the meeting closed. The great theme of "*Life only through Christ*" is clearly advancing *mightily*. To God be all the glory. We were entertained by Br. Geo. T. Adams and his beloved wife, where we found a home last Spring. We returned home in safety, tho' the roads had been badly washed by the heavy rains. The Lord be praised for all his mercy to us and ours. The friends in Boston will accept our thanks for their remembrance of us in pecuniary matters.

———o———

BOOKS.—We made an arrangement with GEO. T. ADAMS, 167 Hanover-st., Boston, so that all persons in that region, and in the State of Maine, can be supplied with "*Bible vs. Tradition*," and "*Death not Life*," at the same *wholesale* prices as at our office in New York. Br. Adams will keep a constant supply on hand. The demand for them is increasing; at which we rejoice as evidence that the *Life Theme* is waking up attention in community. May there be no slumbering on the subject. Br. Adams has been prompt in calling for Bible vs. Tradition, and in *paying* for them. He has bought and sold more than any other person. His heart is full of love to the doctrine of "Life only through Christ."

———o———

"PAULINE THEOLOGY; or, *The Christian Doctrine of Future Punishment as Taught in the Epistles of Paul.* By H. L. Hastings, Plymouth, Mass." A neat pamphlet of 48 pages, 12 mo.

This is a most valuable and convincing work. There can be nothing better to put into hands of persons who are unacquainted with our views. It ought to be scattered into every corner of the land; and put into every house in city and country. Arrangements have been made with the author for issuing it hereafter at the Office of the Bible Examiner; and it is to be put at the low price of $4 per hundred, for cash. Retail, *eight cents.*

We wish to publish a large edition. Thirty or forty thousand ought to be issued and scattered at once. Will the friends let us know how many they will take, and send the cash that we may be able to pay the cost, and "*owe* no man anything." Let those who have funds see that this work is sent on its mission of *truth* and *mercy* without delay. Br. Hastings will be a regular contributor to the Bible Examiner the year to come, we expect.

———o———

BIBLE VS. TRADITION.—This work continues to go rapidly. The "*Third* Edition" was more than half sold the past month. Let it be sent into every city, town, and neighborhood: it is a thorough cure for the natural immortality theory; and shows beyond a reasonable doubt that Life and Immortality are the gift of God through Jesus Christ *alone*, and by the resurrection at the last day.

Price, 75 cents. For $5, *ten* copies. Sent in all cases at the expense of the purchaser, except where $1 is sent for one copy, and the two double Examiners containing Ham's Works, then we pay the postage.

———o———

PERVERSION OF LANGUAGE.—At the funeral of Dr. Geo. Cox, of Williamsburg, the past month, "Rev. E. S. Porter, of the Dutch Reform Church," concluded his address with a quotation from "Sir Thomas Browne, M.D.," as follows:—

"There is but one who died savingly for us and is able to say unto Death, hitherto shalt thou go and no further. Only *one* enlivening Death which makes gardens of graves and that which was sowed in corruption to arise and flourish in glory; when Death itself shall die and living shall have no period; *when the damned shall mourn at the funeral of death; when life in despair shall be the wages of sin; when the second death shall be a miserable life and destruction shall be courted.*"

The part italicised is that to which we call attention. We confess it is a mystery how an intelligent congregation can sit and hear such a shocking *perversion* of the truth of God. Paul saith, "*The wages of sin is death.*" "*No*,"—saith modern theology—"The wages of sin is *life in despair!*" Thus Paul stands corrected!! "*The soul that sinneth it shall die*," saith God. "*No*," —saith modern theology—"The second death shall be a *miserable life!*" Thus God is charged with folly, by failing to express what he means; and Dr. Browne, and "Rev. E. S. Porter," are the *dis*-"honored instruments" in correcting Jehovah!—God saith, Ps. 145: 20, he will *preserve* all them them that love him; "but all the wicked will he *destroy*." "That is not true," cries the "*ortho*-

doxy," under consideration, for "*destruction shall be courted!*"

We do not wonder that infidelity and atheism is so rapidly spreading through christendom when such a mixture of folly and blasphemy is taught by those who profess to know what the Bible teaches. But we know the power of *traditionary* teaching, and these "orthodox" men, we trust, will yet see that they "teach for doctrines the commandments [traditions] of men;" and have turned aside from the truth of God. We do not feel disposed to revile them for their present want of more perfectly understanding the testimony of God, but we do deeply lament the destroying influence of such *anti*-scriptural teaching. "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do."

ZION'S HERALD.

From Sept. 14th onward for nine weeks, "REV. N. D. GEORGE," a Methodist Minister, in the M. E. Church, published articles under the following caption—"MATERIALISM ANTI-SCRIPTURAL; or, *The Doctrines of George Storrs Examined and Refuted.*" This head, it seems, was used to catch attention to a running fire on a pamphlet by "Z. Campbell;" for he has scarcely noticed our writings, but has spent most of his *nine* shots on the last named person. We shall, however, give him a passing notice in the form of a dialogue. *Geo.* stands for N. D. George, and *Exr.* for Examiner.

Exr. My friend, if it had pleased you to have kept to your announcement, and "examined" the "doctrines" Mr. Storrs advocates, we could have given you more credit for consistency. Instead of this, however, you give Mr. Storrs a passing *fling* and rush on to meet one whom you seem to think you can more easily attack with the small arms you have to use. Happy for you, that you did not deem it prudent to attack the Mosaic account of creation, and of man's formation, as that would have shown that your weapons were "*rotten wood*" which could not endure the "*material*" of creation. Till you establish it as a fact that "*man*" was not "*formed of the dust of the ground*," all you build is but "wood, hay, and stubble," or a "house built upon the *sand*." Had you intended to have "reviewed" Mr. Storrs' doctrinal views, why had you not commenced with Moses' account, where he did, and follow him step by step through, what you are pleased to call his "erratic driftings," till you could have shown wherein he misunderstood Moses, or misinterpreted his writings? Why leave the entire foundation of his argument and pass almost entirely by his superstructure to light on another, whose peculiar views Mr. Storrs is not responsible for, whether true or false? Did Mr. Storrs' independent exposition of the Bible so throw you off your track that you thought best to light on some other road?

Geo. "Mr. Storrs says: 'I shall call no man master or father that now lives or ever did live. It will not weigh a straw in my mind what any of the so-called 'fathers' have said or written: but what saith the testimony of God?' And yet in the same pamphlet in which this extract is found, we find the names of Theophylact, Luther, Whately, Blackburn, Tillotson, Wakefield, Campbell, Clarke, Dwight, and others, used to strengthen some of his points!"

Exr. "Mr. Storrs" had not one of the names you have enumerated in his "Six Sermons," from which you select his expression. These name were, several years after, placed in the same covers with other matter, but not as a part of the Sermons: he adhered to his determination strictly through the Six Sermons. The names spoken of were given several years afterwards for the information of some people who regard the authority of men more than that of God; just as crutches are given to lame people who cannot walk without. Those names were *not* given "to strengthen" any "point" in his Sermons; they were given simply as *facts*.

Geo. "Materialism upturns the whole foundation of the Christian system, and when adopted brings in its train the most destructive errors. Its tendency, as might be expected, is not to improve the moral and religious condition of the people, but to induce skeptical views respecting the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion."

Exr. "Materialism" lays at the foundation of *creation*, and lays a solid basis for the "Christian system;" and without it you yourself would be but a *phantasma*—a *phantom*, nothing. It is *immaterialism* that prostrates the Christian system by denying, in fact, the whole Mosaic account of creation, and upturning the Christian doctrine of the resurrection *of man*, by making that resurrection as useless as *two bodies* would be to one individual. As to the improving "the moral and religious condition of the people," we are quite willing to leave that to the judgment of God. But can you tell what the advocates of the theory you oppose do teach?

Geo. "They teach that subsequent to death men have no conscious existence until their resurrection, that when Christ shall come the dead shall be raised, and brought to judgment, when the wicked will be punished with the second death, or annihilation, and the righteous will be rewarded with immortality. They will have it that when the words *perish*, and *destroy*, and *death* are used to designate the punishment of the wicked they are to be understood literally, and not in an accommodated or figurative sense. The advocates of these senti-

ments can have no patience whatever with the current idea that the righteous enter bliss immediately when the body dies, and of course *deny the endless punishment of the wicked.* These being the prominent points in their theory, all must see that there is a wide difference between them and christendom generally, and that if they are right the churches are composed of a host of either ignorant or wilful heretics."

Exr. A pretty fair statement if we except the expression—"and of course they deny the endless punishment of the wicked"—which is a total misrepresentation. They do not deny any such thing; but they do affirm that the wicked are to "be punished with everlasting *destruction*," and not with everlasting *preservation* in misery. "The Lord *preserveth* all them that *love* him, but all the *wicked* will he *destroy*:" Psa. 145: 20. There *is* this "wide difference between them and christendom generally:" They believe God *means* what he says; and their opposers seem to have no faith of that kind, but suppose God speaks in a "*figurative* sense." If you are disposed to call yourselves "either ignorant or wilful heretics," if we "are right," we cannot help that: it may be true, though we would prefer to use milder terms, and simply say, that you are *mistaken*, as we once were ourselves. We would be glad if you could see the truth, as we regard it, on these points: and we think you may yet be led to see *traditions* are not always the truth. Doubtless the Jews thought the first Christians differed widely from their theology; and the Papal church thought Luther and the Reformers differed so widely from them that that church must have been "ignorant or wilful heretics," if Luther was right. But did that prove that either the first Christians or the Reformers were wrong? By no means, except in the minds of bigots.

Geo. "We now come to the examination of Scriptures urged in support of Materialism. Eccl. 9: 5—'The dead know not anything.' This sentence, torn out of its connection, is often quoted with an air of triumph as teaching the extinction of the soul. Now we might dispatch this with a stroke, and admit that all of a man that is dead knows not anything, and then throw the burden of proof upon our opponents to show that the soul is dead."

Exr. No great of a "burden" either, unless you admit that *matter* possesss the attribute of *knowledge*, which would be fatal to your whole theory. Your "*dispatch stroke*," therefore, is an admission that "the soul *is* dead:" for that *only* was ever capable of *knowledge*, according to your theory.

What have you to say of the following text—Ps. 6: 5—"For in death there is no remembrance of thee: in *the grave* who shall give thee thanks?"

Geo. "That *the dead body*, that which goes into the grave, *cannot give thanks* is all very clear.—But what evidence is this that the soul does not exist? None at all. If because it is said, 'in death there is no remembrance of thee," we must come to the conclusion that the soul dies with the body, then by the same mode of reasoning we must conclude that Deity dies; for David says, (Ps. 88: 4, 5,) "I am counted with them that go down to the pit:—free among the dead, like the slain that lie in the grave, *whom thou* (the Lord) *remember-est no more*." Now, if the above quoted texts prove that God's creatures have no conscious existence because it is said they remember him no more, then for *the same reason God* has no conscious existence, for it is said of him that he remembers *the dead no more.* An interpretation out of which consistency pushes such a result cannot be truthful. What is here said by the Psalmist is predicated of *that part of man* which goes to dust, and not of that which returns to God who gave it."

Exr. Is it *the man* or the man's *body* that "gives thanks" while man is alive? If the latter then "*materialism*" is not "unscriptural;" nor is *matter* so contemptible as you would have your readers think. But whatever gave thanks in life it is the same that *does it not* in death. If, then, it was an "*immaterial*" something in man that did it, it now ceases to do it when man is dead; and it is "*very clear*" that you have only *evaded* the question at issue. In your next remarks I presume you have made your best effort at argument, and we will very cheerfully show you the utter fallacy of it.—Because it is said of a *dead man* that he has "*no remembrance* of God," therefore, *God* must be *dead* if he remembers the dead no more, according to your opponents. Such is your reasoning. Our reply is, *First*—God is never said to be *dead: man* is said to be dead, *to die;* therefore, there is no analogy in the two cases. *Second*—God is declared to be *immortal*, [1 Tim. 1: 17,] man is never said to be immortal; not once in all the Bible: thus, while God cannot die, man can and does die. Hence, it does not follow that God's not remembering proves them both in the same state; for of the first it is said, he is *living;* of the other, he is *dead.* Quite a difference, friend *Geo.* In relation to God, we know *he liveth.* In relation to man we know *he dieth;* therefore, "for the same reason" we know that the *non*-remembrance of God and man must be essentially of a different character. In God's case it must, from necessity, be understood in a *restricted* sense; in man's case no such necessity exists, unless you can prove man is as *undying* as his Maker. That is the point for you to prove: you are not to *assume* it, and then reason as you have. We prove that *man* dies, and the Scriptures affirm of the *dead man* that he is

"*asleep*"—having "*no knowledge*"—"*no remembrance* of God." When you can find a text that saith God is *dead*, then, "for the same reason," we will say, He "has no conscious existence." Do you see any difference between *a dead man* and "*the living God?*" Because the latter is said, in a restricted sense, not to remember the dead, *must* God be *dead*, or man *alive* when he is dead, because he is said to have no remembrance of God? Is that logical or scriptural? Show, if you can, that a necessity does exist for restricting the sense in case of a *dead man*. To talk of "Eastern poetry" will not answer here. Is it "Eastern poetry" to say that God is "*immortal?*" It is Pagan and Papal "poetry" to say that man has an immortal soul; and Protestants have adopted it for sober truth; thus arming Papacy against themselves to their own confusion: for take away this Papal doctrine, and that entire system is at an end. That lives, fattens, flourishes, and triumphs on the vain imagination of souls existing consciously when *the man is dead!* Yea, "Spirit Rappings," with all its abominations, lives on the same. How long will Protestants continue to feed these two scourges of the earth by maintaining the system against which we speak? "In death there is no remembrance of" God: "in the grave [*sheol: the state of death*] who shall give thee thanks?" The term here translated *grave* is not *kever*—the proper Hebrew word for grave—but *sheol*—the *covered, hidden state*, or state of death. There, where dead men go—and not simply in the *grave*—there is no giving thanks to God; and that is proof positive that there is "*no knowledge*" in that state; hence unconsciousness is the condition of dead *men*, and not of dead *bodies* merely, as you affirm.

What have you to say of the following text,—Ps. 146: 3, 4—"Put not thy trust in princes, nor in the son of man in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish."

Geo. "The term '*perish*,' as defined by our opponents, means *annihilation*, and they bring the text under consideration to prove that the whole man *perishes;* when? at the day of judgment when they say the wicked are to be annihilated?—No; but in the very day that he returns to the earth. Now, if perish means to come *to nothing*, as they contend, then the intellectual man is *annihilated* in the very day when 'his breath goeth forth,' and he returns to his earth, and it follows then that if the intellectual part of man is *annihilated* at death, it can never come up in the resurrection to be judged, for that which is not *in existence* cannot be raised. There is no evading this while the literal meaning of the term *perish*, which is '*to come to nothing*,' is insisted on in connection with this or any other passage where temporal death, or death of the *body*, is named. A new thing may be created resembling that which *came to nothing*, and may be called by the same name, but it can never be the same thing. If the sticklers for literalism can inform us how a thing that has *literally come to nothing* can be *literally* raised, they will by so doing shed some light upon their own darkness. Paul shows us most conclusively (1 Cor. 15,) that all which *goes into the grave will surely come up*. But if the intellectual man is stricken out of existence at death, as the sense they attach to the word *perish* indicates, we ask again how a mere nonentity can be raised?

Exr. As the force of your remarks here consists in your substitution of words and deffinitions we do not use, or give, we will show your weakness by quoting your remarks and substituting in brackets the proper words for your perverted ones, and you will then speak in harmony with truth: thus:—

"The term '*perish*,' as defined by our opponents, means [*death*], and they bring the text under consideration to prove that the whole man [*dies*].—Now, if perish means [*to die,*] as they contend, then the intellectual man is [*dead*] in the very day when 'his breath goeth forth' and he returns to his earth, and it follows then that if the intellectual part of man is [*dead*] at death, it can never come up in the resurrection to be judged, for that which is not in [*life*] cannot be raised. There is no evading this while the literal meaning of the term *perish*, which is [*to die,*] is insisted on in connection with this or any other passage where temporal death, or death of the [*man*] is named. A new thing may be created resembling that which [*died*] and may be called by the same name, but it can never be the same thing. If the sticklers for literalism can inform us how a thing that has *literally* [*died*] can be literally raised, they will by so doing shed some light upon their own darkness. Paul shows us most conclusively (1 Cor. 15,) that all which [*died*] will surely [*be made alive again*]. But if the intellectual man is [*dead*] at death, as the sense they attach to the word *perish* indicates, we ask again, how a mere [*dead man*] can be raised?

Thus, friend *Geo.*, you see how easy it is to strip your triumphant and towering fallacy of its wide-spead wings, and to show out of your own mouth that you are but a modern *Sadducee*, "not knowing the *power* of God;" and in fact, scoffing at the resurrection of *the dead*. Well has Andrew Carmichael, M. R. I. A., in his "Disquisitions on the Theology and Metaphysics of Scripture," said—"It cannot be too often repeated: *If there be an immortal soul there is no resurrection; if there be any resurrection there is no immortal soul.*" Vol. 2, p. 315.

Your theory denies the resurrection of *the dead*, the very subject the apostle argues in 1 Cor. 15.—"Some man will say how are *the dead* raised up? and with what *body* do *they* [*the dead*] come?—

Thou fool, that which thou sowest is *not quickened except it die.*"

But you maintain, that if *it die* it cannot be quickened, or "raised." Whether Paul designed his sharp rebuke for such as you, judge ye. We believe there can be no such thing as a resurrection without a death first—it is *the dead* that are raised; and the Scriptures affirm that "*man dieth;*" you affirm *man* does not die only in part; therefore there is only a part of man to be raised, and you will find it quite as difficult to give or get credit to the idea that the *identical body* that died will be raised after all its multiplied changes from animal to vegetable, and back from vegetable to animal, and after having been eaten by dogs, wolves, bears, tigers, &c., with unknown and unnumbered transformations which it may have passed through, as to believe that though a man's intellect was suspended in its operations in death, yet God can revive it again by his power, if he will.

How do you say the term "*thoughts*," in Psa. 146: 7, should be translated?

Geo. "The term ought to have been rendered *projects, schemes,* or *splendors,* instead of *thoughts.* This fact completely destroys the argument raised from the text in favor of Materialism, and gives a pertinency and force to the caution of the Psalmist which is not found in its application to '*thoughts;*' for men might be in danger of trusting in princes because of their worldly projects and splendor, but not on account of their thoughts after death. Materialism gains nothing from this text."

Exr. "Materialism" *loses* "nothing by" your rendering; for you make the text utter a falsehood. We ask, do the "*projects*" or "*schemes*" of eminent men always come to an end, or "perish," when they die? History, in many instances, gives the lie to such a construction. Did the "scheme and project" of the founders of this *Republic* "perish *in the very day*" *they died?* Certainly not. So far from its being true, in that respect, their *schemes* and *projects* have gone on in greater prosperity than they ever imagined. Besides, the Psalmist excludes the explanation you speak of, by the emphatic expression, "*in that very day* his thoughts perish." That could be true of "thoughts," but it would seldom, if ever, be true of their "schemes and projects." For, if defeated at all, some time must usually intervene before they would be made to come to an end. Your interpretation being, therefore, manifestly false, as a general event, the term "thoughts" is most likely to be the true sense of the text; and all your "parade" of learned men and their "schemes" to prove themselves "immortals" truly "perishes."

We may discuss this subject more with you hereafter, if we can find time and space: we dismiss it now by inviting you to read the new work we have recently published, entitled "*Bible vs. Tradition;*" there you will find your *traditions* about an immortal soul in man, fully exposed and exploded.

———o———

HERESY HUNTERS.—The doctrine of *endless torture* is so unlike any just view of the character of God, and so eternally irreconcilable with his perfections, that Theologians must keep a sharp look out or all their hearers and pupils will have abandoned a doctrine which better suited an age of *savage blindness* than one when "many shall run to and fro and knowledge be increased." It is quite time that the "*idol*" of *eternal torments* was given "to the moles and the bats:" for surely a man must be theologically blinder than the bats to think that so God-dishonoring a doctrine can live in the light of the Bible, when men can read that book for themselves. The Bible teach *eternal torture!*—*Never:* no such blasphemy is found on its sacred pages; and theologians will find that the time has come that something more than their *assertions* will be necessary to make such a Papal bugbear pass for sober truth. They must *hunt* carefully and purge out quickly anything and every one that even looks like doubting the horrible fable that God has put forth his omnipotence to create innumerable sensitive beings whom he is determined to perpetually sustain in being that he may horribly and unceasingly torture, with no design to reform, and under circumstances where reform is impossible, and an eternal *necessity* exists for increasing wickedness. These reflections have arisen in our mind by reading the following article from the *London Daily News,* by a late arrival. Says the *News:*—

There has been an under current of agitation in London society for some days, about an event of which only the barest notice has yet been taken in the journals—the dismissal of Rev. FREDERICK MAURICE from his professorship in King's College. There will, no doubt, be a good deal of ink spent upon it before the interest of the affair is exhausted, but as yet the buzz of talk has not found expression in that way. The scientific world has a very strong feeling about the matter in one direction, and the ecclesiastical in another; while the educated part of general society seems to be divided—with a strong leaning, on the whole, to the side of the censured Professor. The cause of the dismissal of a man so unimpeachable in private character—so valued by his brother Professors, and so beloved by the students of King's College, is the old difficulty—never ending, still beginning—difference of theological opinion. Professor MAURICE has lately published a volume of Theological Essays, from a careful examination of which the Principal of the College, Dr. JELF, believes himself able to gather that Mr. MAURICE *disbelieves in the eternity*

of future punishments. It is avowedly only by a very careful collation of passages that this conclusion can be arrived at. It does not seem to be imputed to Mr. Maurice that he has taught heresy to anybody in particular, or to any class of students; or, indeed, that he has taught it at all. It is merely that Dr. Jelf and his orthodox partisans have made out from a book a case of constructive heresy, and that they conclude therefrom that Prof. Maurice is an unsafe guide of youth, and get him turned out of his office. If he had been the most commonplace and the dullest of professors and men, such a procedure as this would have invested him with interest at once; for he is thus made the centre of a conflict of principles in which mankind can never lose their interest. Being, as it is commonly understood that he is, singularly esteemed and beloved by those who are now to be deprived of his co-operation and his instructions, the commotion caused by this treatment of him is very great. We have no other interest in the matter than as watchers over the operation of social principles; but, as mere observers, we cannot but see that Dr. Jelf and those who have voted with him have taken a step, of the seriousness of which they can scarcely be aware. * * * It is not the whole Council, however, that is involved in the disgrace. It is understood that those who declared Mr. Maurice guilty of heresy were strongly opposed, and that they would have been defeated but for the absence of a few members. If so, those members must deeply lament their absence; for there is no saying how much injury has been done to the College and to the Church, by a decision which offends the judgment of the mature as much as it exasperates the affections of the young.

This we call "*heresy hunting;*" but the *hunters* may find it not as profitable business as they supposed. Prof. Maurice may not believe in the "*eternity of future punishment:*" and in this he may be mistaken, and we think he is; for we regard the punishment eternal; and that punishment is "*death,*" which Paul saith "*is the wages of sin:*" *not life in misery.* The wicked "shall not be"—"shall be no more"—"be as though they had not been;" so saith the Bible.

THE SCARLET BEAST.

We expressed the opinion last January that the *revived* Napoleon Dynasty is the "Scarlet-colored Beast," of Rev. 17. We have seen nothing since that time to alter our mind. The fact that France was one of the *ten* original "*horns,*" is no argument, that a Dynasty might not arise there which should, in the style of prophecy, be denominated a *beast.* The "little horn" of Daniel 7th is presented Rev. 13th as a Beast with ten horns. Then, surely, there is no lack of analogy in supposing that a body of rulers, or a *dynasty,* might arise and have dominion on a territory as a *beast* when previous ones had been represented by a horn; and especially, seeing the dynasty last arising is not the hereditary one, as in the case of the Napoleon Dynasty. While we have been satisfied that this dynasty is the scarlet-colored beast, and that the harlot woman sits upon it, and is dependent upon it for its very being, we have not been satisfied from what quarter the *ten horns* were to be developed who would "give their power and strength unto the beast." We have waited to see, and thought it might be the ten States of Italy. It is possible, however, that they may arise, or be found more widely spread over Europe; and late rumors from the East seem to indicate that it will be so. We clip the following from the *New York Daily Times,* of Nov. 21. If it is the design of Louis Napoleon to *revolutionize* Europe, as this article intimates, it will not be long before the "ten horns" will be manifest, and "their power" be given "to the beast:" then will the "*harlot*" be made "desolate and naked, and be burned with fire." But we forbear forestalling the events which are just before us, and wait for the development.

Rumors Concerning Louis Napoleon's Intentions.

The mission of Gen. D'Hilliers with a staff of officers, whose presence at Constantinople would, under any other circumstance, of itself alone be sufficient cause of apprehension and offence to Russia, has produced wide-spread sensation as indicative of a warlike intention on the part of Louis Napoleon, who is, moreover, on the point of replacing his present minister at the court of St. Petersburg by *another military man,* Gen. Canrobert.

A correspondent of *Le Republicain* speaks of these indications as follows:

Paris, Wednesday, Nov. 3, 1853.

The democracy has dug its mines, and laid the train under every throne in Europe; the nephew of his uncle will apply the fire. The flag of '89 and '92 is somewhere in the Mazas or the Tuileries: they will take it from its case, they will wave it in the eyes of oppressed nations whom they will summon to insurrection, to emancipation; Poland will rise, Hungary will rise, Italy will rise, Bohemia and all Germany will rise at the voice of the Emperor. The latter, conqueror everywhere, will make Berlin, Vienna and St. Petersburg but prefectures of his empire.

Such has been the language of Persigny for some days past, and, depend upon it, there is, at the bottom of these Bonapartist vauntings, a certain amount of truth, one part of which is, that Louis Napoleon *thinks himself called upon to raise the oppressed nations of the Continent.* Yes, the very same man who overthrew the Republic and has established an iron despotism in France, thinks that he can at least seize the flag of liberty and give the signal of a European Revolution."

The writer then proceeds to comment upon the incongruities of such an alliance, and concludes by predicting the turn that it will take.

"M. Bonaparte dreams, on his feet, of a revolu-

tionary war of propagand, followed by general victory and more elections. So be it! Let him sound the *Marseillaise*, and he will see with what instruments the French people will accompany it!"

—o—

OMINOUS.—The "*Society of Universal Democratic Republicanism*," at their meeting, in this city, Nov. 22d, among other matters, read a "*Communication Respecting Italy*," from "GUGLIELMO GAJANI," of much interest. We give the following item from it as ominous of the coming fate of Papacy, and as showing that the prophecy, Rev. 17—"These shall *hate* the whore, and eat her flesh and burn her with fire"—is hastening to its fulfillment. The item is as follows:—

"Both Italians and strangers agree that there can be no salvation for Italy without the destruction of the Papacy, through which monstrous and cruel power Italy has been brought to suffer all the tortures by which for ten centuries she has been lacerated."

The Republicans consider that power as the head of all despotism; and of course it will be one of their first objects to destroy it, as it is a primary object with all European despots to sustain it.—The same communication states that—

"The Count of BOUTENIEFF, the Russian Ambassador, publicly said in Rome, in 1849, that if the Catholic powers had not undertaken to restore Pio IX., the Russian Emperor himself would have done it, since the Pope represents in himself the principle of AUTHORITY, through which every Sovereign reigns."

All those despots are doomed to fall together. "Democratic Republicans" may destroy them, yet nothing but the reign of Christ can give true peace on earth.

—o—

AN EXHORTATION.

BY H. L. H.

In every important investigation of Christian doctrine there exists a danger of having our attention so fully occupied by the arguments sustaining a position that we forget the important *results* and practical *inferences* which are to be deduced from the doctrines when established.

The investigation of the doctrine of Life through Christ alone, is no exception to this general rule.—Some men had always rather argue than exhort. They had rather strive than pray. They had rather preach than practice the truth, and apparently rather convert one man to their peculiar opinions than a score of men from the ways of sin to the paths of peace.

This is not right. Doctrines are of no use only as they are practiced. Men may go to perdition with their heads full of truth. To hold the truth and fight for it is one thing. To be *sanctified through it* is another. To preach the truth is one thing, but to do it for the sole object of saving perishing men requires a zeal, and faith, and love, which but few possess. Lord increase the number.

Brethren, how is it with us? Do we realize these things? Do we tell the truth as if we felt in our hearts? Do we labor warning every man and teaching every man that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus?

How is it, reader? Do you feel as you ought that he that converteth a sinner shall save a SOUL from DEATH? Then let your earnest endeavors for the salvation of men prove to all, that your faith is something more than a mere mockery—an idle phantom—a vain imagination.

Recollect also that the cause of truth, the honor of God, and the welfare of souls, demands that you labor to disseminate this truth. It will not do to remain silent. We are not allowed the privilege of being inactive. We are not permitted to retain even the *name* of Christians among some who reject the gospel doctrines of life and immortality as revealed in the Scriptures. We are cast out. We are misrepresented and traduced. There is only one course to take. *We must prepare for it.*—The investigation *must proceed* and the public must understand that this matter is not disposed of by a curse, or dismissed from notice in silent contempt. This subject must be thoroughly canvassed, and if theologians wish to make head against it, they must become better acquainted with this controversy than they have been heretofore.

It must be the purpose of believers to urge the matter upon public consideration, not roughly and unkindly, but in the spirit and temper of Him who did not "*strive*" or "*cry*," but yet who did not "*fail*" or become "*discouraged*."

We need an unflinching purpose to do God's will—an entire devotedness to his cause—a profound conviction that we are not to judge men or to fear their judgment—a spirit of *sacrifice* and a disposition to cast ourselves entirely upon God's truth, thus becoming identified with it and dead indeed unto the world and alive to God and his cause.

Above all let us so live that men seeing our good works may glorify our Father in heaven. Let not truth be wounded in the house of its friends by unkind and unchristian conduct. While you maintain a readiness to give to every one that asketh of you a reason of the hope that is within you, let it be "with meekness and fear," and let Christian patience characterize all your communications with those who may oppose themselves to the truth as it is Christ Jesus. "*In meekness instructing them that oppose themselves*," is as much a dictate of sound sense as of sound doctrine. Let not your neglect to make a practical application of the subjects under consideration, give countenance to the idea that these are only '*opinions*,' having no practical bearing upon earthly life—no living energy when applied to the events of this world as compared with that which is to come.

Remember that the "broad" road "leadeth to DESTRUCTION," and can you be indifferent to the melancholy fact, that "*many there be that go in thereat?*" Have you no word of warning, of exhortation, of entreaty, to offer to them? Can you say *to-day*, or before *the judgment seat of Christ*, I am pure from the blood of all men? Remember the slumbering multitudes discern not the approaching sword; and shall *you* fail to give them warn-

ing? then shall God require at *your* hand their blood.

Remember he that winneth *souls* is wise. Will you be thus wise? Around you are those who may shine for ever as the brightness of the firmament. O, will you suffer them to go down to the "blackness of darkness for ever," and yet neglect to turn their eyes away to the glad rising of the eternal morning, and the resplendent glories of perpetual day?

O, let these considerations excite us to laborious, constant, and energetic effort in the cause of God. Let us baptize our souls in the Love of God. Let us keep ourselves in it praying always in the Holy Ghost. Let us fight the good fight of faith and lay hold on eternal life.

A little while and we must meet our Judge.—Are we ready? Have we warned those around us as we should? Have we sought for glory, and honor, and immortality, with the ardor worthy of such a matchless prize? If so let us patiently continue in the pursuit of the crown before us, but if not let us gird up our loins, shake the slumber from our souls, forsake our sin and worldliness, and strive with all our powers to gain eternal life.

Plymouth, Mass., Nov. 23, 1853.

———o———

RECEIPTS OF PROV. COM. DURING NOVEMBER.

From friends in New York city, by Br. Blain,	$13,00
" " Williamsburg, N. Y., "	9,00
" " Newark, N. J., "	3,00
" " LaFayette, Ind., C. M. Richmond,	9,00
From a friend in St. Catharines, C. W.,	1,00
Br. Blain, without the names of the donors,	25,00
Total,	$60,00

DISBURSEMENTS DURING NOVEMBER.

Paid for printing blanks for use of Agents,	$2,00
" Br. Blain,	25,00
" J. S. White,	20,00
" C. M. Richmond,	28,08
Total,	$75,08
Treasury overdrawn, past month,	$15,08

———o———

"THE ADVENT REVIEW *and Sabbath Herald*," is a neat quarto paper, of eight pages, published weekly, by ELD. JAMES WHITE, Rochester, N. Y., at $1,50 per year. Its *main object* is to defend the *Seventh Day Sabbath*, and urge its observance as the ordinance of God.

———o———

INDEX FOR 1853.

Æternitas—Moncrieff, 33, 81, 116, 177
Analytical Investigations, &c., 90, 138
Authenticity of Scripture, 107
Awakening Begun and Advances, 120, 136
Aged Believer, 151
Bible vs. Tradition, Extract from 6, 58, 86
Beautiful—North. Chris. Advocate, 89
Bible Convention at Hartford, Conn., 104, 144, 159
Barker, Joseph 112
Bold Assumption, 111, 124
Baptism—by the Editor, 154
Booked for Hell—H. L. H., 165
Christianity of its first Preachers—Ham, 1
Christian Examiner—Ham's. 35
Christian Love—Moncrieff's Exp., 53
Christ the Bread of Life—Expositor, 93
Constitution of Man—Moncrieff, 173
Doubtful Text.—Rev. 20: 5, 16
Dr. Dick—As might be Expected, 89
Doctrine of the Cross, 91, 113, 130, 145, 179, 163
Death in Scripture—Bishop Law, 94
Death not Life—Blain—Extract. 139
Expositor of Life and Immortality, 51
East New Jersey—Quite a Storm, 73
Evangelical Society, 109
Edwards on Future Punishment, 134
Excerpts—R. Wendell, 167
French Empire—Editor and Alling, 9, 42
Future Retribution, Stuart,s Remarks, 25
Future Punishment, Scripture Doctrine, 69
Faber's Sacred Calender of Prophecy, 151
God not the God of the Dead—Ham, 20
Great River Euphrates—Editor, 123
Good Advice—Ham, 144
Hell—Hell Fire, 15
Heresy—"Power of Immortality," 15
Historical Inquiry—Ham, 37, 49, 65
Human Materialism—Mon., 98, 118, 133, 148, 161
How it Sounds—Pres. Pierce's Son, 143
Heresy Hunters, 189
Immortal Soul, objection to 13
Immortality—T. Read, 21
Judgment—by the Editor, 102, 125
Little less than God—Moncrieff, 84
Letters—Rev. H. H. Dobney, 11; Rev. E. White, England, 41; Dr. Lees, 56; Br. Blain, 61, 173; Dr. Lee, N. C., 95; C. M. Richmond, 62, 110, 127, 143, 158, 170; L. C. Lamb, 63; Br. Wilson, the aged, 127; Dr. Everson, 151; Mrs. Colver, 143.
Non-Resurrection, C. W. L., & Macknight, 22, 46
Orange Scott, 32
Orthodoxy partially right.—Moncrieff, 129
Poetry—God is Love, 16; Sinner's Friend, 32; God not a Tormenter, 48; Our Departed Friends, 64; Sleep in Hope, 96; When Satisfied, 128.
Penalty of the Law—Inquiry, 2, 23
Prov. Com., 40, 54, 72, 88, 109, 128, 136, 160, 169
Probationary State, Dr. McCulloh, 97
Plenary, 107
Religious Faculty, Dr. Lees, 17
Rich Man and Lazarus, by the Editor, 77
Robert Owen and Spirit Rapping, 108
Supposed Strong Hold, &c.—Ham, 2
Souls under the Altar.—Pres. Weethee, 14
Significant Fact, Evang. Alliance, 28
Soul, Body, and Spirit, 47
Spirit Rappings: New York Times, 171
Sectarianism, 176, 181
Scarlet Beast, 190
Turned to Fables, 13
Truth Onward and Advancing, 57, 74
Tour West, 152
Visits—To Buffalo, 24; to Boston, 56, 185; to Dansville, 168.
Whole Truth, 121, 142, 170